

Author: Charles K. Fairchild

FOOD STAMP PROGRAM OPERATIONS STUDY

REPORT ON CENSUS OF STATE OPERATIONS:
JOB SEARCH PROGRAMS

FINAL REPORT

February 1987

Prepared for:

U.S. Department of Agriculture
Food and Nutrition Service
3101 Park Center Drive
Alexandria, VA 22302

Prepared by:

Abt Associates Inc.
4250 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20008

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This report was prepared by Abt Associates Inc., subcontractor to Mathematica Policy Research under Contract No. 53-3198-5-51 from the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Service, Office of Analysis and Evaluation.

This report represents a team effort in which a number of individuals made important contributions in addition to the author. In particular, I want to recognize the contribution to the project of Boyd Kowal, the project officer, as well as Abigail Nichols, Jill Herndon and Christine Kissmer of the Food and Nutrition Service. The state census interviews were skillfully conducted by Cathy Casserly and Julie Daft under the direction of Linda Wray. Janine Kendall constructed the data base and prepared the tables. Terry Kendrick provided frequent comments and suggestions during the preparation of the report. Margo Ross and Marsha Strother prepared the manuscript.

Finally, I am most grateful for the cooperation of those state officials and staff who provided information on job search programs in their states and shared their substantial knowledge with us.

CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	ii
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....	v
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
A. GOALS OF THE CENSUS OF WORK REGISTRATION/JOB SEARCH PROGRAMS.....	1
B. SAMPLING AND INTERVIEWING METHODS.....	5
C. SCOPE OF REPORTED RESULTS.....	5
D. ORGANIZATION OF THE REPORT.....	6
II. PROGRAM STATUS AND COVERAGE.....	7
A. COVERAGE OF THE FOOD STAMP CASELOAD.....	7
B. WORK REGISTRANTS.....	8
C. JOB SEARCH PROGRAM ACTIVITY.....	12
D. FUNDING, STAFFING, AND ORGANIZATION.....	16
E. ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS COVERED.....	19
F. GEOGRAPHIC COVERAGE.....	20
G. SUMMARY.....	23
III. PROGRAM FUNCTIONS.....	25
A. ORGANIZATION.....	25
B. ASSESSMENT AND ASSIGNMENT.....	25
C. TRAINING AND EMPLOYMENT SERVICES.....	26
D. SUMMARY.....	32
IV. REPORTING.....	33
A. TABULATION PROCEDURES.....	34
B. FORMS AND DEFINITIONS.....	36
C. NONCOMPLIANCE AND DISQUALIFICATION.....	39
D. SPECIFIC REPORTING PROBLEMS	40
E. SUMMARY.....	42
V. FUTURE PROGRAMS.....	45
A. EXPANSION PRIORITIES AND TARGETING.....	45
B. NEW PROGRAM ELEMENTS.....	46
C. PROGRAM GOALS.....	48
D. SUCCESSFUL PROGRAMS.....	50
E. SUMMARY.....	50
APPENDIX A - JOB SEARCH CENSUS INSTRUMENTS	
APPENDIX B - SUPPLEMENTAL TABLES	

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE II.1 - FOOD STAMP CASELOADS, JOB SEARCH CONTRACTS AND POPULATION COVERAGE.....	9
TABLE II.2 - WORK REGISTRATION/JOB SEARCH ACTIVITY.....	13
TABLE III.3 - FUNDING, STAFFING, AND COST RATIOS.....	17
TABLE II.4 - COUNTIES HAVING EACH EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING PROGRAM.....	21
TABLE III.1 - RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN USE OF SUBCONTRACTS AND MODE OF DELIVERY OF COUNSELING/TRAINING SERVICES.....	28
TABLE III.2 - RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN USE OF SUBCONTRACTS AND JOB SEARCH PROGRAM COMPONENTS.....	30
TABLE IV.1 - SUMMARY OF TABULATION PROCEDURES.....	35

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Work registration has been required of able-bodied, nonexempt food stamp recipients since 1971. Job search also has been an important employment and training service provided to food stamp recipients. Prior to 1982, State Job Service agencies administered work registration and job search activities with funds transferred from the U.S. Department of Agriculture to the U.S. Department of Labor. Since that time, work registration has been accomplished in all States by registering at the Food Stamp Agency, while job search has been administered by Food Stamp Agencies having job search contracts with the Food and Nutrition Service (FNS). As of FY 1986, 40 States have job search contracts. Job search consists of up to 24 employer contacts in an 8-week period. Registrants also are required to report for interviews and to accept bona fide job offers.

The Food Security Act of 1985 requires all States to implement employment and training programs for nonexempt registrants. Under the final rule issued December 31, 1986, each State must operate one or more of the following employment and training components: a job search program comparable with that of AFDC which may include applicant job search; a program that includes job search training; workfare; work experience and training; or programs aimed at assisting recipients in obtaining employment, such as coordinating with the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) or State-administered programs. States will have discretion over what program components will be implemented and how they will be targeted within the overall performance standards of the program.

FNS has sponsored this research effort to learn more about the operations and reporting under the current job search program and about potential State plans for implementation of the new program. Work registration is one of six topics covered in a study of Food Stamp Program operations, being carried out by Mathematica Policy Research, Inc., with Abt Associates Inc. and The Urban Institute as subcontractors.

The first phase of the study involved interviews with food stamp personnel in the 50 States, plus the District of Columbia, Guam, and the Virgin Islands. Questions on the work registration topic covered program status and coverage of the food stamp caseload, program functions and organization, reporting, and plans for the future program. This report presents and summarizes the findings in each topic area.

PROGRAM STATUS AND COVERAGE

Job search programs operated in 40 States in FY 1986, with a total funding of approximately \$30 million. Job search coverage was Statewide in 9 States, and the areas covered in the 31 sub-State programs represented a majority of the food stamp cases in those States. The mix of Public Assistance (PA) and non-Public-Assistance (NPA) cases in the covered areas was generally similar to that in each State as a whole.

Participation in job search was limited to NPA cases in 14 States and covered both NPA and PA cases in 22 States. Only one State restricted job search to PA cases. Exempt recipients were allowed voluntary participation in job search in 22 States.

Exploratory analyses of the dynamics of participation in job search were performed by comparing the numbers of referred cases with the numbers reported to be in various program statuses over a 5-month period. These analyses showed that the median number of individuals assessed to be job ready per month per State, 427, represented 55 percent of the number referred to the job search program. The median number employed was 16 percent of the number referred across the States, but the range was from less than 5 percent to over 40 percent. Noncompliance and disqualification incidents were equivalent to 31 and 13 percent of referrals, respectively.

PROGRAM FUNCTIONS

Work registration exemption determination, referral for assessment, and disqualifications are performed by the Food Stamp Agencies in all States. In 30 States, the job search functions of assessment and assignment, job search monitoring, and notification of failure to comply were subcontracted, almost always to the State Job Service agency. In the remaining 10 States, these functions were performed by special units in the Food Stamp Agency.

Considerable diversity existed in the range of employment and training services offered. Thirty-eight States offered job referral services, 23 States provided job development services, and 6 States had workfare programs. Fourteen States reported offering classroom skills training and 10 States on-the-job training.

Job search monitoring closely conformed to the standard requirements in most States, with 35 States requiring 24 contacts in an 8-week period. Thirty States required contact reports twice during the job search period, two States required reports only once, and eight States varied requirements according to registrant circumstances. Confirmation of contact reports was limited to 1 contact in 11 States; 26 States confirm more than 1 contact; and 3 States adjust confirmation to individual circumstances.

REPORTING

Reporting inconsistencies and incompleteness have been continuing problems in the job search program. Nearly all States count registrants every time they participate in a program component or enter a program status. This may overstate the extent of participation. Also, it is not clear that all States have the means to avoid referring nonexempt recipients to job search at every recertification.

The number of States with computerized tracking and reporting systems for job search is fairly small. Most tabulations of referrals, assessments, entries to job search, placed/employed, noncompliance, and disqualifications are performed at the local level; fewer than a dozen States are able to use computers for purposes other than referrals and disqualifications. Referrals and disqualifications are tabulated by computer in 12 and 16 States, respectively. Additionally, tabulations are potentially distorted because most States count changes in status cumulatively, and thus may count individual registrants more than once in a single year. Some States also cannot determine which participants are mandatory registrants and which are volunteers. Finally, approximately 8 to 10 States report having the capability to conduct online entry/query for various case statuses in the job search program, with 4 to 9 additional States able to produce computerized statistical reports. Information on disqualifications was more likely to be computerized than any other type of data.

FUTURE PROGRAMS

States could not provide definitive statements about their plans for implementing the new employment and training program

components authorized under the Food Security Act of 1985, because neither funding nor proposed regulations had been announced at the time of the census. Some declined to speculate until they had further information.

Of those responding, 45 States indicated that they might add or expand job search training or coordination with other programs, 32 might add work experience and training, and 40 are likely to pay participant expenses. Applicant job search was mentioned by only 17 States and workfare by only 13. Thirty States reported plans to include both PA and NPA cases in expanded services, and virtually all States plan to cover both new cases and recertifications.

Overall, States responded favorably to the concept of employment and training programs for food stamp work registrants. The most frequently mentioned key program characteristics were adequacy of funding and the design and implementation of training and placement activities. Fourteen States also mentioned flexibility as a major factor.

I. INTRODUCTION

This report describes the results of interviews with State Food Stamp Agency officials concerning the work registration/job search programs operated during Fiscal Year 1986. The interviews were conducted as part of the first phase of the Food Stamp Program Operations Study (FSPOS). This study is being conducted by Mathematica Policy Research, Inc. under contract to the Food and Nutrition Service, with Abt Associates Inc. and The Urban Institute as subcontractors. Other topics covered in this first phase of the study, referred to in the report as the "census" of State agencies, are: automated certification systems, claims collection, computer matching, monthly reporting, and quality control. The results of the census interviews in these five other topic areas appear in companion reports.

The Program Operations Study will consist of three phases of data collection and analysis. The first phase, the census, entailed telephone interviews with State agency staff in the 53 State-level Food Stamp Agencies (including the District of Columbia, Guam, and the Virgin Islands) concerning practices and procedures in the six areas of food stamp operation named above. The second phase involves the collection of data concerning claims collection and computer match followup operations in a national sample of 191 local agencies in October-November 1986. Finally, in the spring of 1987, the third phase of the study will be carried out. This last phase will consist of intensive examination of selected sites, focusing on assessment of the costs and benefits of particularly promising examples of operation identified in the first two phases of the study. Further project reports will be issued on phases 2 and 3.

This introduction first outlines the goals of the census interviews relevant to job search programs. A brief review is then presented of the sources of data, including a description of the agency sample and interviewing methods used. The following section discusses the scope of the reported results, and the last section describes the organization of the remainder of the report.

A. GOALS OF THE CENSUS OF WORK REGISTRATION/JOB SEARCH PROGRAMS

Federal law and regulations require all nonexempt food stamp recipients to register for work as a condition for eligibility to receive food stamps. The exemption criteria in force during FY 1986 excluded the following nine categories of recipients:

- (1) Younger than 18 or 60 years or older.
- (2) Physically or mentally unfit for employment.
- (3) Participating in the Work Incentive Program (WIN).
- (4) Responsible for care of a child under age 6 or an incapacitated person.
- (5) Parent or caretaker of a child under age 18, where another household member is registered for work or employed.
- (6) Unemployment compensation recipient.
- (7) Participating in a drug or alcohol treatment program.
- (8) Employed a minimum of 30 hours weekly.
- (9) Student enrolled at least half time.

In addition, persons in geographically remote areas can be exempted permanently. Those who are job-attached (i.e., on temporary layoff expecting recall) or employed temporarily can be exempted for 60 days, while those with temporary barriers to employment may be exempted from job search for a limited time.

The proposed regulations for the new employment and training program will subject heads of households ages 16 and 17 who are not attending school half time or more, nor participating in an employment and training program, to the work requirements. However, certain individuals and categories of individuals may be exempt from employment and training program participation on the basis of a short certification period (30 days or less); availability of work opportunities and the cost effectiveness of the requirements; personal circumstances, such as lack of job readiness or child care; and good cause for nonparticipation lasting 60 days or longer.

Current
Program

Under the program in effect since the beginning of FY 1983, FNS has funded job search programs under contracts negotiated individually with the States. In FY 1986, 40 States had such contracts in effect. Under the terms of the contract, the State provided job search services to a targeted number of work registrants. The permitted criteria for selection of registrants included residence in a geographic region with a high concentration of registrants or better job

markets; households eligible to receive high food stamp allotments or those with certifications periods in excess of 2 months; an area without food stamp workfare or a demonstration project; random selection; or job readiness, as determined by the State agency.

Services and activities include scheduling work registrants for interviews; assessing job readiness; assigning job-ready registrants to job search, which requires up to 24 prospective employer contacts in 8 weeks; supervising job search; reporting to the food stamp office those who fail to comply without good cause and those who obtain employment; and monitoring job search activities. Other services and activities were permitted in accordance with State plans as approved by FNS.

Under the new regulations, all States will be required to operate employment and training programs having components additional to registration and assessment. The minimum level of effort required of participants must be comparable to spending approximately 12 hours a month for 2 months making job contacts, and the program must offer one or more of the following components: job search, job search training, workfare, and/or work experience.

Study Objectives

Because States were allowed considerable latitude in the design and operation of the job search programs, a primary goal of this study was to document how the States organized and operated these programs. A second goal was to document the services offered in addition to the minimum job search program. Third, the activity reports received from a number of States had inconsistencies, and FNS wanted to identify the causes of these problems. Finally, FNS wanted to know which of the new employment and training components were likely to be implemented in the States.

The major questions that guided the census effort can be summarized as follows:

1. What is the status of the food stamp job search requirement in the States?
 - a. How many States are involved?
 - b. What are the operating statistics (numbers assessed, placed, sanctioned, etc.)?

2. What are the administrative arrangements under which job search operates in the States?
 - a. How are responsibilities allocated among agencies?
 - b. What are the job search requirements, operating procedures, and monitoring/reporting procedures?
 - c. What staff are involved?
3. What are the costs of operating job search?
 - a. What are the total costs?
4. What causes the discrepancies and inconsistencies in reporting?
 - a. What definitions are used in counting activities?
 - b. How do manual reporting systems compare with computerized systems?
5. What program components are States likely to implement under the new regulation?
 - a. How will States target the new programs?
 - b. What program components are preferred by the States and why?
 - c. What problems and issues are likely to emerge in implementation?

Systematic description of work registration/job search programs and exploration of factors affecting reporting discrepancies and inconsistencies were major objectives of the census. However, after the passage of the Food Security Act in December of 1985, more emphasis was placed on issues relating to implementation of the new program, and less on assessing the costs and outcomes of the current program.

B. SAMPLING AND INTERVIEWING METHODS

The intent of the census was to interview officials in all 50 States plus the District of Columbia, Guam, and the Virgin Islands to ascertain the current status of work registration and to collect data on plans for the new programs in the future. (Throughout this report, we refer to all 53 of these jurisdictions as States.) The States having job search contracts were asked detailed questions about program organization and operations, program services and activities, and reporting.

Interviews

Interviews were completed with all 53 States with food stamp agency staff and, in a number of States, with the staff of agencies (usually State Job Services) subcontracted to provide job search services. No interviews were left incomplete due to nonresponse, although some States did not have information on all items covered in the questionnaires. The organization and operation of the programs varied by county in some States. Descriptions of these variations were recorded by the interviewers, but the design of the survey did not allow separate documentation of local organizations or operations.

Interview respondents were nominated by State Food Stamp Program (FSP) directors or their delegates in preliminary telephone discussions with senior research staff. In most instances, there was a single respondent, often the director of the job search program. In some cases, the FSP director suggested several different respondents to respond to particular parts of the instrument. Interviewers sometimes encountered situations in which the primary respondent referred the interviewer to other agency staff for specific topics. About one-third of the interviews involved contacting more than one respondent. The interviews lasted about 1 hour on the average.

Use of Materials from State Agencies

Three types of materials were received from State Agencies and used in the analysis, in addition to the interviews. First, each State job search contract was abstracted prior to the census, to obtain data on the planned level of funding, coverage of the state, and services to be offered. Second, the monthly reports of program activities available at the start of the census were examined to ascertain the overall patterns of work registrant flow through the job search activity. Third, states were requested to send in copies of their internal report forms. These were used to confirm and update the activity data reported in the census and to identify the extent to which state reports contain more

information than required for reporting to FNS under the contracts.

C. SCOPE OF REPORTED RESULTS

The interviews were designed to provide consistent, systematic data on work registration and plans for future programs in all States, as well as on job search programs in the States having contracts. As a result, the instrument design emphasized developing carefully worded questions that would elicit structured, codable responses. Although this approach lends itself well to quantitative analysis and comparisons across States in standard categories, it also leads to certain limits on the instrument's ability to capture detail and subtle differences across State programs.

Apart from this characteristic of the survey approach, the major weakness of the survey results derives from the limited quantitative information available from the States. Many States did not have readily available data on the number of work registrants in the State as a whole or in sub-State areas covered by the job search contract. Few States had data already tabulated on program participation except those required in FNS reports. The number of States reporting each item is shown in the detailed tables (included in Appendix B), and key items are described in the text.

D. ORGANIZATION OF THE REPORT

The remainder of this report is organized into five parts. Part II describes the organization and operations of the job search program in the States, including data on the numbers of registrants served and planned staffing and budgets. Part III describes program activities and functions in the States with job search contracts, while part IV analyzes reporting issues in these States. Part V presents the data from all States on their preliminary plans for implementing new programs under the Food Security Act of 1985. The survey questionnaire is included as Appendix A. Appendix B contains detailed tables of individual State responses.

II. PROGRAM STATUS AND COVERAGE

The job search census instrument Module 1 collected information relating to the status and coverage of work registration/job search activities. The Census collected information from 53 State Food Stamp Agencies (including the District of Columbia, Guam, and the Virgin Islands). A total of 40 States had job search programs in FY 1986, funded at a total of \$30 million. Proposals were received from three additional States but were not funded. Included in the total costs were two States receiving funds for part of the year. This chapter summarizes the status and coverage of the job search program in terms of share of caseload covered, activity levels, funding, and selection of programs covered.

A. COVERAGE OF THE FOOD STAMP CASELOAD

Data were collected on the statewide average monthly food stamp caseload by Public Assistance (PA) and non-Public-Assistance (NPA) cases; by the area(s) served by job search (if not statewide); by the number of work registrants; and by the number of job search participants and their outcomes. The purpose was to measure the penetration of job search in the areas currently served and the overall percentage of total caseload covered.

Table II.1 presents the average monthly food stamp caseload data for all States and the caseloads in covered areas for States with job search programs. For statewide job search programs, the same data are used in both sections of the table. Nationwide, 7.3 million cases received food stamps. Of these, 54.5 percent were NPA cases. In the 40 job search States, there were 5.3 million cases, of which 58.5 percent were NPA cases. These 40 States contained about 72 percent of all cases.

The areas covered by job search programs (including statewide programs) had 3.2 million cases, or 59.7 percent of the total caseload in these States. Of these, 58.6 percent were NPA's, similar to the case mix in the Nation as a whole.

In most States, the job search programs covered a representative mix of PA and NPA cases that was comparable to the case mix in the State as a whole (see appendix table B.1). Exceptions to this general observation are Illinois and New York. In Illinois, 75.4 percent of the PA caseload was covered, as compared with only 35.1 percent of the NPA caseload. This was because the job search program operated only in Cook County (Chicago), where NPA cases were a lower share of the total than in the State as a whole.

In New York, the coverage ratio went the opposite direction. Job search accounted for 45.5 percent of the NPA's, as compared with 17.9 percent of PA cases. Job search operates in 34 counties exclusive of New York City and Westchester and Suffolk Counties. Therefore, the covered caseload is only 25.5 percent of the total. The job search program in New York covers all non-AFDC food stamp recipients and also is coordinated with individual, county-level programs for General Assistance (GA) recipients.

The new program regulations and performance standards are designed to encourage broad program coverage, and it is likely that the patterns observed in the census will continue.

B. WORK REGISTRANTS

States were asked to report the number of work registrants in the 5-month period October 1985 through February 1986. Since there is no Federal requirement to tabulate or report this information, only 19 States were able to provide statewide

TABLE 11.1
FOOD STAMP CASELOADS, JOB SEARCH CONTRACTS, AND POPULATION COVERAGE--CONTINUED

STATE	Statewide Caseload (Q.1.01.01)			Job Search Contract			Covered Caseload (Q.1.07)			Covered No. of Work Registrants (Q.1.08)
	Public Assistance	Non-Public Assistance	Total	Statewide No. of Work Registrants (Q.1.01.02)	FY 1986? Statewide		Public Assistance	Non-Public Assistance	Total	
					(1=Yes) (Q.1.04)	(1=Yes) (Q.1.05)				
Missouri	47,472	91,162	138,634	49,159	1	1	47,472	91,162	138,634	49,159
Montana	8,225	13,203	21,428		1		4,693	6,840	11,533	
Nebraska	12,400	24,356	36,756		1		1,500	2,900	4,400	1,137
Nevada	2,725	13,317	16,042	5,679	1		2,534	12,053	14,587	5,679
New Hampshire	7,735	3,416	11,151	3,725	1		4,183	1,830	6,013	1,141
New Jersey	94,889	69,442	164,331		1	1	94,889	69,442	164,331	
New Mexico	43,962	198,170	242,132	5,607	1	1	43,962	198,170	242,132	5,607
New York	471,110	178,630	649,740	213,478	1		84,507	81,307	165,814	49,019
North Carolina	70,397	102,292	172,689	12,692	1		70,397	102,292	172,689	12,692
North Dakota	3,571	9,158	12,729							
Ohio	276,352	166,219	442,571	200,000						
Oklahoma	45,513	53,874	99,387		1		21,416	23,033	44,449	11,592
Oregon	29,480	60,000	89,480		1		9,827	20,000	29,827	3,380
Pennsylvania	223,218	204,312	427,530							
Rhode Island	15,844	10,756	26,600							
South Carolina	44,881	74,525	119,406		1		44,881	74,525	119,406	4,980
South Dakota	2,912	13,375	16,287		1		1,513	6,232	7,745	2,123
Tennessee	26,811	158,051	184,778		1		18,768	110,636	129,345	
Texas	79,106	335,720	414,826		1		43,019	182,569	225,588	86,184
Utah	11,000	13,405	24,405							
Vermont	10,122	19,258	29,380		1		367	2,722	3,089	411
Virginia	50,041	83,588	133,629		1		16,167	24,203	40,370	7,269
Washington	46,271	67,388	113,659		1	1	46,271	67,388	113,659	
West Virginia	33,470	61,453	94,923	37,508	1	1	33,470	61,453	94,923	37,508
Wisconsin	88,847	42,586	131,433		1		16,192	7,454	23,646	2,828

CONTINUED

TABLE 11.1
FOOD STAMP CASELOADS, JOB SEARCH CONTRACTS, AND POPULATION COVERAGE

STATE	Average Monthly Statewide Caseload (Q.1.01.01)			Job Search Contract					
				Statewide		Covered Caseload (Q.1.07)			Covered No. of Work Registrants (Q.1.08)
	Public Assistance	Non-Public Assistance	Total	No. of Work Registrants (Q.1.01.02)	FY 1986? Statewide (1=Yes) (Q.1.04) (Q.1.05)	Public Assistance	Non-Public Assistance	Total	
Alabama	45,667	142,368	188,035	13,021	1	21,365	66,512	87,877	13,021
Alaska	3,504	2,067	5,571		1	1,044	616	1,661	
Arizona	16,027	47,333	63,360		1	11,585	29,646	41,231	5,022
Arkansas	10,696	76,569	87,265		1	5,307	31,556	36,863	4,675
California	362,046	185,458	547,504		1	257,487	131,898	389,385	
Colorado	29,306	36,681	65,982		1	1,478	1,766	3,244	2,362
Connecticut	27,000	24,000	51,000						
Delaware	6,600	6,000	12,600	1,745	1	6,600	6,000	12,600	1,745
Dist. of Columbia	12,459	16,664	29,123						
Florida	52,644	181,072	233,716	40,961	1	47,433	159,294	206,727	30,172
Georgia	36,403	148,404	184,807	50,000	1	12,879	52,505	65,385	8,177
Hawaii	17,665	18,207	35,872	1,689	1	11,891	11,644	23,535	1,689
Idaho	8,991	10,808	19,799		1	3,679	4,423	8,102	
Illinois	300,967	128,704	329,671		1	226,988	45,222	272,210	33,766
Indiana	33,525	95,106	128,631	45,715					
Iowa	32,448	46,098	78,546		1	32,448	46,098	78,546	
Kansas	23,167	21,823	44,990	7,382	1	4,170	3,601	7,771	831
Kentucky	28,920	157,157	186,077		1	10,531	29,229	39,760	9,105
Louisiana	41,550	166,001	207,551	99,000					
Maine	18,000	29,000	47,000		1	3,449	6,021	9,470	1,550
Maryland	61,080	51,063	112,143						
Massachusetts	111,037	27,501	138,538						
Michigan	308,600	106,082	414,682	321,587					
Minnesota	58,809	29,375	88,184		1	34,418	21,745	56,163	13,421
Mississippi	16,493	141,062	161,483		1	4,604	39,379	45,080	5,563

CONTINUED

TABLE 11.1
FOOD STAMP CASELOADS, JOB SEARCH CONTRACTS, AND POPULATION COVERAGE--CONTINUED

STATE	Statewide Caseload (Q.1.01.01)			Job Search Contract			Covered Caseload (Q.1.07)			Covered No. of Work Registrants (Q.1.08)
	Public Assistance	Non-Public Assistance	Total	Statewide No. of Work Registrants (Q.1.01.02)	FY 1986? Statewide		Public Assistance	Non-Public Assistance	Total	
					(1=Yes) (Q.1.04)	(1=Yes) (Q.1.05)				
Wyoming	3,758	6,365	10,123	5,839						
Guam	1,376	3,436	4,812	894	1	1	1,376	3,436	4,812	894
Virgin Islands	724	6,792	7,516		1	1	724	6,792	7,516	
SUMMARY:										
All States	53	53	53	19						
Sum	3,415,816	3,978,852	7,298,107	1,115,681						
Average	64,449	75,073	137,700	58,720						
Covered Areas	40	40	40	14	40		40	40	40	31
Sum	2,286,822	3,082,220	5,272,481	443,540			1,305,485	1,843,594	3,150,116	412,702
Average	57,171	77,056	131,812	31,681			32,637	46,090	78,753	13,313

information, and only 31 of the 40 States with job search contracts reported counts of work registrants. In the 19 States (both with and without job search contracts) reporting the statewide number of work registrants for a 5-month period, the average was almost 59,000 (with a median of 13,021). In the 31 States with job search contracts that reported the number of covered work registrants, the average was about 13,313 registrants (with a median of 5,563) for the 5-month period.

C. JOB SEARCH PROGRAM ACTIVITY

The 40 States with job service contracts are required to prepare monthly and year-to date reports summarizing the number of individuals in various participation statuses, or found to be out of compliance or disqualified. (Appendix table B.2 tabulates these data by State.) The States are required to prepare monthly and year-to-date reports covering seven items:

- (1) Referred for assessment;
- (2) Assessed;
- (3) Job Ready;
- (4) Entered Job Search;
- (5) Placed or Entered Employment;
- (6) Noncompliant; and
- (7) Disqualified for failure to comply.

In the census, States were asked for data on these items from October 1, 1985 through February 28, 1986.

The average monthly number of work registrants referred for assessment across all 40 States was 1,826 (with a median of 1,019), and ranged from a high of 14,198 in Texas to 100 or less in Alaska, Guam, Vermont, and the Virgin Islands. The number job ready, the number who entered job search, and other activity measures were compared with the base of referred registrants to approximate the program operation measures that might be put into place under the Food Security Act (see table II.2). Another possible base of comparison would be the number assessed. However, the difference between the number referred and the number assessed could reflect (1) number of registrants who do not report for assessment and who are later found noncompliant, and (2) insufficient staff capacity to schedule and conduct assessments. For these reasons, the number referred is the better basis of comparison.

TABLE 11.2
WORK REGISTRATION/JOB SEARCH ACTIVITY PERCENTAGES
(Q.1.09)

STATE	Activity and Outcomes as a Percent of Referred				
	Job Ready	Entered Job Search	Entered Employment	Found Non-Compliant	Disqualified
Alabama	52.75	46.83	19.74	33.38	5.57
Alaska	54.62	54.62	17.67	35.94	11.04
Arizona	40.60	41.80	16.05	42.19	22.04
Arkansas	79.76	69.29	12.65	33.18	18.48
California	42.07	31.27	7.80	42.78	8.34
Colorado	51.31	51.31	31.92	30.99	30.14
Delaware	42.64	41.26	12.26	55.13	13.70
Florida	36.93	35.63	19.05	23.81	13.11
Georgia	47.62	29.19	27.25	47.69	16.09
Guam	29.75	29.75	18.57	45.19	31.99
Hawaii	60.25	46.12	8.18	65.33	17.58
Idaho	43.60	30.37	7.44	18.01	11.11
Illinois	100.00	100.00	8.36	18.32	14.80
Iowa	59.86	41.39	5.53	27.52	7.39
Kansas	41.42	41.42	11.70	21.63	16.23
Kentucky	53.39	53.39	2.83	5.65	5.65
Maine	44.26	41.39	27.34	21.75	14.20
Minnesota	60.25	56.66	10.08	34.75	20.69
Mississippi	46.09	46.09	10.08	21.18	18.77
Missouri	99.14	5.78	2.60	0.55	0.68
Montana	59.12	57.56	25.20	63.10	16.12
Nebraska	99.74	81.97	19.96	29.02	23.39
Nevada	39.25	43.93	27.24	57.76	39.18
New Hampshire	61.17	56.70	19.63	19.11	9.29
New Jersey	54.87	42.84	7.45	22.27	15.77

CONTINUED

TABLE 11.2
 WORK REGISTRATION/JOB SEARCH ACTIVITY PERCENTAGES--CONTINUED
 (Q.1.09)

STATE	Activity and Outcomes as a Percent of Referred				
	Job Ready	Entered Job Search	Entered Employment	Found Non- Compliant	Disqualified
New Mexico	27.61	27.61	23.58	31.53	3.28
New York	64.18	25.33	7.88	15.74	16.22
North Carolina	76.18	69.64	11.94	10.78	6.39
Oklahoma	63.08	42.76	15.38	37.39	13.25
Oregon	80.16	78.93	40.34	3.17	2.46
South Carolina	0.00	26.19	18.62	46.13	15.82
South Dakota	38.62	28.50	12.48	20.49	2.68
Tennessee	56.58	56.56	28.60	44.65	8.14
Texas	23.05	23.05	6.56	42.65	7.73
Vermont	91.54	91.54	29.62	40.31	6.01
Virgin Islands	81.60	81.60	41.04	36.79	0.00
Virginia	70.40	70.27	20.11	17.40	13.36
Washington	55.97	55.97	11.20	32.02	12.97
West Virginia	70.80	59.03	6.65	4.62	8.88
Wisconsin	62.62	75.25	17.61	25.25	35.40

These comparisons should be viewed as exploratory, because there are many factors that may reduce their usefulness as indicators of program operations. These factors include differences in States' definitions of activities, carryover from a previous time period, waiting periods for services, seasonal fluctuations in employment, and others.

The number found job ready averaged 1,004 per State per month (with a median of 427), or about 55 percent of the number referred for assessment. More than 90 percent of those referred were found job ready in four States, while five States reported that under 40 percent of referrals were found job ready.

The number who entered job search during this period was, in most States, nearly as large as the number job ready, probably because most States count registrants as "entering" job search as soon as they are assigned to job search. A notable exception to this pattern was Missouri, where the number reported as job ready was nearly the same as the number referred, but the number reported as entering job search was only 5.8 percent of the number referred. The State attributed this discrepancy to problems with automation of the reporting system.^{2/}

The number employed is a key measure of the success of job search programs. It is defined as the number who find jobs on their own plus the number who are placed in jobs with assistance from the program. Overall, the median number employed was 15.7 percent of the number referred across the States, but the range was from under 5 percent to over 40 percent.

Noncompliance and disqualification are the reported negative outcomes of the job search program. A notice of noncompliance is issued if a registrant fails to report for assessment or fails to comply with job search requirements. Across the 40 States, an average of 30.6 percent of referrals were reported as noncompliant (median = 31.3), with a range from under 5 percent in 3 States to over 50 percent in 4 States.

^{2/}Missouri reported that the cumulative number job ready should have been about 39,000, or 80 percent of the number referred, and the number who entered job search should be about 23,000, or 47 percent of the number referred. Revised data were not available for the other categories.

Disqualification can result from a notice of noncompliance, but disqualification is not automatic. The eligibility unit must receive the notice of noncompliance, review the case to determine whether it is still active, issue a notice of adverse action, and hear any appeal to the disqualification. Additional complications in this process can arise if recertified registrants are referred to job search more than once per year or if eligibility staff allow cures of noncompliance. As shown in table II.2, the average percent of referrals disqualified was 13.8 (median = 13.3), less than half the percentage found noncompliant during the same period. The range was from under 3 percent in two States to over 30 percent in four States. Contrary to expectations, there did not appear to be a strong relationship between noncompliance rates and disqualification rates, probably because of differences in States' disqualifications processing.

D. FUNDING, STAFFING, AND ORGANIZATION

Table II.3 summarizes the funding, organization, and staffing of the job search programs and presents data on budgeted funding per annualized referral and obtained employment. The job search program is funded by negotiated contract in response to State proposals. The contracts conform to a standard format specified by FNS, but States propose the level of activity, geographic coverage, and organization. As documented further below, some States provide the entire range of services through the State Food Stamp Agency, while others subcontract the job search function to other agencies, usually the State Job Service.

The total funding reported by the States was \$28,044,304, slightly less than the \$30 million authorized for the program. Because some States reported that discussions to revise funding were in progress, the final FY 1986 funding levels for any State program may vary slightly from the numbers presented in the table. The range of funding was from \$42,000 in Vermont to \$2.9 million in California.

Most States funded in FY 1986 also operated programs in FY 1985, although some reported that the number of counties covered in FY 1986 was less than in FY 1985, because costs rose while the available funding remained constant.

The staff levels reported by the States averaged 24.2 full-time-equivalent (FTE) positions, ranging from a low of 1.5 positions in the Virgin Islands to 103 positions in Florida.

TABLE 11.3
FUNDING, STAFFING, AND COST RATIOS

STATE	Annual Funding (Q.1.10.01)	FTE Staff (Q.1.10.02)	Sub- Contract (1=Yes) (Q.1.10.03)	Funding per:		
				Referral	Employed	FTE Staff
Alabama	\$965,396	31.0	1	\$28.44	\$144.07	\$31,142
Alaska	\$228,970	5.0	1	\$191.57	\$1,084.14	\$45,794
Arizona	\$719,185	17.0	1	\$59.67	\$371.79	\$42,305
Arkansas	\$606,910	17.0	1	\$66.37	\$524.65	\$35,701
California	\$2,922,510		1	\$63.79	\$818.36	
Colorado	\$503,695	16.0	0	\$88.85	\$278.35	\$31,481
Delaware	\$187,349	5.0	1	\$44.73	\$364.78	\$37,470
Florida	\$2,334,531	103.0	1	\$32.24	\$169.26	\$22,665
Georgia	\$1,265,943	39.0	1	\$64.51	\$236.75	\$32,460
Guam	\$20,304	2.0	1	\$18.93	\$101.93	\$10,152
Hawaii	\$280,355	9.0	1	\$44.26	\$540.81	\$31,151
Idaho	\$272,008	7.0	1	\$25.69	\$345.41	\$38,858
Illinois	\$1,507,348	65.0	0	\$18.60	\$222.48	\$23,190
Iowa	\$677,746	51.5	1	\$20.93	\$378.54	\$13,160
Kansas	\$282,274	15.0	0	\$59.85	\$511.37	\$18,818
Kentucky	\$432,001	14.0	0	\$19.77	\$697.68	\$30,857
Maine	\$138,965	5.0	0	\$174.93	\$639.80	\$27,793
Minnesota	\$566,410	16.0	1	\$34.43	\$341.54	\$35,401
Mississippi	\$683,638	28.0	0	\$51.20	\$507.75	\$24,416
Missouri	\$864,588	30.0	1	\$11.75	\$451.36	\$28,820
Montana	\$215,195	7.0	1	\$55.80	\$221.39	\$30,742
Nebraska	\$126,763	4.0	1	\$46.45	\$232.68	\$31,691
Nevada	\$239,880	6.0	1	\$17.60	\$64.61	\$39,980
New Hampshire	\$164,197	6.0	1	\$59.96	\$305.43	\$27,366
New Jersey	\$473,963		1	\$69.68	\$935.95	

CONTINUED

TABLE 11.3
FUNDING, STAFFING, AND COST RATIOS--CONTINUED

STATE	Annual Funding (Q.1.10.01)	FTE Staff (Q.1.10.02)	Sub- Contract (1=Yes) (Q.1.10.03)	Funding per:		
				Referral	Employed	FTE Staff
New Mexico	\$507,339	18.0	1	\$37.70	\$159.90	\$28,186
New York	\$1,493,583	54.0	1	\$60.27	\$764.53	\$27,659
North Carolina	\$1,195,714	41.0	1	\$60.62	\$507.86	\$29,164
Oklahoma	\$430,088	17.0	0	\$15.46	\$100.51	\$25,299
Oregon	\$284,022	15.0	0	\$104.91	\$260.09	\$18,935
South Carolina	\$559,510	24.0	1	\$50.08	\$269.00	\$23,313
South Dakota	\$169,650	6.0	1	\$33.30	\$266.75	\$28,275
Tennessee	\$1,203,621	52.0	1	\$72.09	\$252.01	\$23,147
Texas	\$2,091,559	59.0	1	\$12.28	\$187.21	\$35,450
Vermont	\$42,000	2.0	1	\$38.98	\$131.58	\$21,000
Virgin Islands	\$45,283	1.5	1	\$89.00	\$216.87	\$30,189
Virginia	\$701,470		0	\$56.58	\$281.31	
Washington	\$1,354,338	35.0	1	\$48.71	\$435.09	\$38,695
West Virginia	\$704,061	45.0	0	\$18.83	\$283.16	\$15,646
Wisconsin	\$581,942	29.0	1	\$85.74	\$486.90	\$20,067
SUMMARY:						
All States	40	37	40	\$40	\$40	\$37
Sum	\$28,044,304	897		\$2,154.55	\$15,093.66	\$1,056,438
Average	\$701,108	24.23		\$53.87	\$377.34	\$28,552

Three States (California, New Jersey, and Virginia) did not report total staffing, although California did report subcontract staffing.

As shown in table II.3, 30 States subcontracted part of the job search services. With one exception (New York), the subcontracts were with the State Job Service and consumed the majority of the resources. The next part of this report discusses these subcontracted functions. (Refer to appendix table B.3, which lists funding and staffing levels for these subcontracts.)

To provide a basis for comparison among the States, we calculated two measures of the average budgeted cost of service: budget per annualized referral; and budget per placement. To compute these numbers, we multiplied 12 times the average monthly activity levels discussed previously and shown in appendix table B.2. Yearly total referrals for assessment and placements are likely to be significantly higher than implied by these monthly figures, because some States were delayed in starting their FY 1986 programs by contract negotiations. In addition, the number of registrants who enter employment in all States could be expected to be higher in the second half of the fiscal year (the summer months) than in the first half (the winter months) due to greater opportunities for temporary employment in the summer months.

The average budgeted State cost per referral to assessment shown in table II.3 is \$53.87, with a range from less than \$12 to almost \$200. The average cost per entered employment was \$377.34, ranging from under \$100 to \$1,000. Although the average budgeted costs per staff member varied widely, from about \$10,000 to over \$40,000, these variations were not associated with variations in costs per activity.

E. ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS COVERED

Key features of the job search program are its coverage of participants in other assistance programs and its geographic coverage (see appendix table B.4). Of the 40 States having programs, 14 covered NPA cases only, 24 covered both PA and NPA cases, and 2 States (Iowa and Oregon) were coded as "other" (see appendix table B.4). Iowa, which has a statewide program, covers all non-AFDC cases whether or not they receive non-AFDC public assistance. A number of other States also covered General Assistance (GA) recipients. Oregon reported covering PA cases only--the only State to exclude NPA food stamp cases.

F. GEOGRAPHIC COVERAGE

Data were collected on the number of counties covered by the job search program, the WIN program, WIN Demonstration programs, workfare, and other employment and training programs to assist FNS in planning new programs under the Food Security Act of 1985. This Act authorizes coordination of job search programs with other employment and training programs. The census instrument asked which counties had each type of program, but did not attempt to determine whether NPA food stamp households were eligible for or required to participate in the employment and training programs other than job search.

Nine States (including Guam and the Virgin Islands) reported Statewide coverage. The remaining States use a number of area selection criteria (see appendix table B.5). Eighteen States selected areas on the basis of large caseload; 22 States (including 16 of the 18 selecting on caseload) cited good job markets as a criterion; and 7 States cited concentrations of households with high food stamp benefits, long certification periods, or job-ready cases as the criteria. States also reported that absence of other programs (6 cases), coordination with other programs (6 cases), local preferences (6 cases), and other criteria (11 cases) were used to select counties. Although all States were allowed the option under the job search contracts of conducting random selection, Iowa and Guam were the only State agencies that reported using this procedure.

Table II.4 summarizes the coverage of all programs in terms of the number of counties covered by each. Job search covered about 25 percent of the counties in the Nation in FY 1985. WIN or WIN Demonstration programs were operated statewide in 20 States, and together covered 47.7 percent of the counties. NPA food stamp recipients are, of course, not usually eligible for WIN or WIN Demonstration projects. Other programs, primarily Community Work Experience (CWEP), were operated statewide in 13 States and in selected counties in 9 additional States, covering 28.3 percent of the counties. Again, most of these other programs did not cover NPA food stamp recipients.

In addition to the programs targeted toward welfare recipients, programs funded by the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) program are available to all eligible low-income persons. The legal eligibility criteria include virtually all AFDC, GA, and food stamp recipients. While some States reported that job

TABLE 11.4
COUNTIES HAVING EACH EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING PROGRAM
(Q.1.02)

STATE	COUNT OF COUNTIES HAVING EACH PROGRAM					PERCENT OF COUNTIES HAVING EACH PROGRAM					
	WR/JS	WIN WIN	DEMO	WORKFARE	OTHER	TOTAL	WR/JS	WIN WIN	DEMO	WORKFARE	OTHER
Alabama	12	9	0	0	0	67	17.9	13.4	0.0	0.0	0.0
Alaska	4	5	0	0	0	29	13.8	17.2	0.0	0.0	0.0
Arizona	3	0	2	0	14	14	21.4	0.0	14.3	0.0	100.0
Arkansas	18	31	16	4	0	75	24.0	41.3	21.3	5.3	0.0
California	9	0	32	2	0	58	15.5	0.0	55.2	3.4	0.0
Colorado	4	4	0	0	0	63	6.3	6.3	0.0	0.0	0.0
Connecticut	0	8	0	0	1	8	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	12.5
Delaware	3	0	3	0	0	3	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
Dist. of Columbia	0	1	0	0	0	1	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Florida	48	0	46	1	0	67	71.6	0.0	68.7	1.5	0.0
Georgia	7	0	6	0	9	161	4.3	0.0	3.7	0.0	5.6
Hawaii	1	1	0	0	1	4	25.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	25.0
Idaho	6	4	0	0	0	44	13.6	9.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
Illinois	1	0	102	1	102	102	1.0	0.0	100.0	1.0	100.0
Indiana	0	0	92	0	6	92	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	6.5
Iowa	99	0	49	0	99	99	100.0	0.0	49.5	0.0	100.0
Kansas	5	4	0	0	20	105	4.8	3.8	0.0	0.0	19.0
Kentucky	4	15	0	0	0	120	3.3	12.5	0.0	0.0	0.0
Louisiana	0	0	0	0	64	64	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Maine	12	0	12	0	16	16	75.0	0.0	75.0	0.0	100.0
Maryland	0	15	10	0	0	24	0.0	62.5	41.7	0.0	0.0
Massachusetts	0	0	14	0	0	14	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
Michigan	0	0	83	0		83	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
Minnesota	28	18	0	0	0	87	32.2	20.7	0.0	0.0	0.0
Mississippi	8	7	0	0	0	82	9.8	8.5	0.0	0.0	0.0
Missouri	115	9	0	0	115	115	100.0	7.8	0.0	0.0	100.0
Montana	6	11	0	0	0	57	10.5	19.3	0.0	0.0	0.0
Nebraska	1	0	0	0	93	93	1.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Nevada	4	2	0	0	0	17	23.5	11.8	0.0	0.0	0.0
New Hampshire	5	5	0	0	5	10	50.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	50.0

CONTINUED

TABLE 11.4
COUNTIES HAVING EACH EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING PROGRAM--CONTINUED
(Q.1.02)

STATE	COUNT OF COUNTIES HAVING EACH PROGRAM					PERCENT OF COUNTIES HAVING EACH PROGRAM					
	WR/JS	WIN WIN DEMO	WORKFARE	OTHER	TOTAL	WR/JS	WIN WIN DEMO	WORKFARE	OTHER		
New Jersey	21	13	21	0	0	21	100.0	61.9	100.0	0.0	0.0
New Mexico	32	32	0	0	0	32	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
New York	34	0	9	0	58	62	54.8	0.0	14.5	0.0	93.5
North Carolina	57	22	0	4	0	100	57.0	22.0	0.0	4.0	0.0
North Dakota	0	0	0	0	0	53	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Ohio	0	18	0	18	18	88	0.0	20.5	0.0	20.5	20.5
Oklahoma	10	0	77	77	0	77	13.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	0.0
Oregon	10	0	36	0	0	36	27.8	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
Pennsylvania	0	0	67	67	0	67	0.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	0.0
Rhode Island	0	5	0	0	0	5	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
South Carolina	19	13	0	2	0	46	41.3	28.3	0.0	4.3	0.0
South Dakota	13	0	13	0	13	67	19.4	0.0	19.4	0.0	19.4
Tennessee	34	0	36	0	0	95	35.8	0.0	37.9	0.0	0.0
Texas	28	0	234	0	0	234	12.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
Utah	0	4	0	0	0	29	0.0	13.8	0.0	0.0	0.0
Vermont	2	14	0	0	14	14	14.3	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Virginia	21	0	104	1	104	104	20.2	0.0	100.0	1.0	100.0
Washington	39	39	0	2	0	39	100.0	100.0	0.0	5.1	0.0
West Virginia	27	0	27	0	27	55	49.1	0.0	49.1	0.0	49.1
Wisconsin	8	0	23	6	72	72	11.1	0.0	31.9	8.3	100.0
Wyoming	3	23	0	0	0	23	13.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Guam	1	1	0	0	1	1	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Virgin Islands	3	3	0	0	3	3	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
TOTAL	765	336	1114	185	855	3097	24.7	10.8	36.0	6.0	27.6

Employment and training programs for welfare recipients were reported in at least half of the counties in the United States, which provides a potential structure for coordinating the new program with existing resources. However, food stamp recipients may not necessarily be able to meet the eligibility requirements of these programs.

The areas covered by job search programs (including statewide programs) had 3.2 million food stamp cases. In most States, the job search programs covered a representative mix of PA and NPA cases, comparable to the case mix in the State as a whole. Participation in the programs varied widely as a percent of the covered caseload, and outcomes also varied. The variations in activity levels were not closely associated with differences among the States in funding levels, and average costs varied independently from variations in costs per staff member. Most States not having statewide job search coverage selected areas on the basis of economic conditions and caseload concentrations. Thirty States subcontracted part of the job

search activity; 29 of these States subcontracted with the Job Service. Although employment and training programs for welfare recipients were reported in at least half of U.S. counties, there was little use of other county-operated employment and training program resources for services to food stamp work registrants.

III. PROGRAM FUNCTIONS

Module 2 of the census instrument collected information about the organization and operations of the work registration/job search program. This part of the report begins with a description of the overall organization of the program in each State. It continues with a discussion of job search training services and monitoring, and concludes with a summary.

A. ORGANIZATION

The organization of the work registration/job search functions follows two basic patterns, depending on whether the FSA subcontracts job search activities. (See appendix table B.6.) In all States, the FSA performs referral for assessment, including selection, review of exemption criteria, and preparation of referral forms. In 35 States, this is performed by eligibility workers in the income maintenance unit. In two States, separate WR/JS units perform referral for assessment. Three States reported that "other" units perform this function. In California, this is done by individual work registration centers in each county. In Iowa, where random selection is used, the referrals are selected by computer. In New York, the referral is done either by the income maintenance unit or a separate WR/JS unit, depending on the county.

In the States in which the FSA subcontracts with the Job Service, the Job Service performs assessment and assignment, job search, and noncompliance reporting. In Alaska, the subcontracted functions are performed by the WIN units. In California, two counties (San Diego and Fresno) have job search units located in the FSA, while the remainder use the Job Service. In New York, the functions vary by county.

Disqualification functions are performed in all States by the FSA, which has the legal authority to issue notices of adverse action for failure of a work registrant to comply with the job search requirements. The noncompliance can occur anywhere in the process, from failure to appear for assessment to failure to complete the assigned job search contacts.

B. ASSESSMENT AND ASSIGNMENT

Assessment is the process by which the staff (special units in the FSA or subcontractor job search units) assess the

experience, abilities, and interests of work registrants; categorize them by degree of job readiness; and assign them to job search, if appropriate. Registrants may be assigned to one of three categories:

Category I - Job Ready

Category II - Non-Job-Ready

Category III - Exempt

Of the 40 States having job search contracts, 35 conducted assessments individually and 15 conducted assessments in groups, including 10 that conducted assessments both individually and in groups. (See appendix table B.7 for individual State responses.) Among these was Mississippi, which varied its approach depending on area needs, caseload demographics, and staff-registrant ratios. In Alaska, Colorado, and West Virginia, assessments were conducted both individually and in groups, depending on the registrants' individual circumstances. In Kansas, assessments were performed either individually or in groups, depending on the geographic area.

The reported average amount of time required to conduct an assessment ranged from 10 minutes in Hawaii and the Virgin Islands, to 182 minutes in Virginia (determined by an agency time study). The range from 30 to 45 minutes was reported by 22 States. The high averages reported by Illinois and Wisconsin--90 and 120 minutes, respectively--are due to the States providing estimates based on the total time for group interviews, rather than for each individual case.

C. TRAINING AND EMPLOYMENT SERVICES

In addition to assessment interviews, 32 States provided some form of job search counseling or training. These were examined to assess the extent to which the types of employment and training services authorized under the Food Security Act of 1985 might already be in place.

Job Search Training

Twenty-eight States provided job search training individually, 21 in groups, and 12 in job clubs. Nine States provided all three methods, with participation depending on location and registrant needs. (See appendix

table B.8 for individual State responses.) All States in the Northeast, Mid-Atlantic, Midwest, and Mountain Plains regions reported offering job search counseling or training; less than half of the States in the Southeast region did so.

Table III.1 shows the relationship between State subcontracting and the modes of services. States not using subcontracts were more likely to provide all three modes of services concurrently (see appendix table B. 8) and to use job clubs.

The overall duration of job search training, the number of hours of participation per day, and whether participation is mandatory vary among the States. Participation was predominantly voluntary in 23 States and mandatory in 9 States, while 1 State reported a mixture of mandatory and voluntary participation. Of the 32 States, 8 reported durations of one day and 11 reported 2 to 5 days. Two others (Maine and New Mexico) reported 20 and 21 days, reflecting continuous job clubs lasting the duration of the job search period. Seven States reported that training lasted 1 or 2 hours per day, 11 States reported 3 to 5 hours, and training lasted 6 or more hours per day in 5 States. States were also asked to report the number of participants in job search training; 13 States reported numbers ranging from less than 30 to slightly more than 26,000. The remaining States did not maintain statistics on this item. (See appendix table B.9 for individual State responses.)

Other Services

Employment and training programs traditionally have provided a number of standard services and components that are authorized for food stamp work registrants under the Food Security Act of 1985. The census collected data on the presence of six of these, in addition to the job search training discussed above:

- referral to jobs;
- job development;
- food stamp workfare;
- classroom training;
- on-the-job training (OJT); and
- other components.

Referral to jobs was offered by 38 States, although from the responses received it was not clear the extent to which the service was referral to specific jobs--the service

TABLE III.1

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN USE OF SUBCONTRACTS AND
MODE OF DELIVERY OF COUNSELING/TRAINING SERVICES

Use of Subcontract	Percent of States		
	Individual	Group	Job Club
No (n=10)	90%	80%	70%
Yes (n=30)	63%	43%	17%

traditionally offered by the Job Service--or merely the mandatory job search. Job development was offered by 23 States. Workfare for food stamp recipients was offered in only six States. Classroom training was reported by 14 States, and OJT by 10; however, some of these States also reported that the training might be available from JTPA programs but was not a formal part of the job search program. (Refer to appendix table B.10 for individual State responses.) Eight States reported typical durations for classroom training, ranging from 1 week (two cases, which are also described as job clubs) to 26 weeks.

Other training was reported by nine States, including the following:

- Arizona reported support service referrals, family counseling, and classroom training.
- Kansas reported 161 participants in job clubs in this category as well as under job search training.
- Minnesota reported vocational testing.
- Montana reported 750 participants in "World of Work" job clubs, out of 950 job-ready registrants.
- The New Hampshire Job Service refers clients to the Office of Economic Services for support services, such as child care.
- New Mexico refers participants to local JTPA training.
- Oregon reported work supplementation and employment preparation.
- Vermont reported the Summer Youth Employment Program, a part of JTPA.
- Guam reported referrals to classroom training.

Table III.2 shows the relationship between the use of subcontracts and types of services. Job development, workfare, and on-the-job training services were reported somewhat more often in States using subcontracts.

TABLE III.2

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN USE OF SUBCONTRACTS AND
JOB SEARCH PROGRAM COMPONENTS

Use of Subcontract	Percent of States					
	Referral	Job Development	FS Workfare	Classroom Training	On-the-Job Training	Other
No (n=10)	90%	40%	10%	40%	10%	20%
Yes (n=30)	97%	63%	17%	33%	30%	23%

While many States do offer some employment and training services, the paucity of data indicates two important features of the program. First, these components do not have enough enrollment to warrant tracking participation, and second, the components frequently are offered in the form of referrals to services provided or funded by other agencies, not as job search services.

Job Search Monitoring

Job search is required of all job-ready registrants, with a maximum of 24 contacts required per year under the FNS contracts; however, the States were allowed to tailor programs to local needs. Therefore, the census collected information on how the job requirement is implemented. (See appendix table B.11 for individual State responses.)

Of the 40 States, 35 required participants to make 24 job search contacts, usually in an 8-week period, while 5 required fewer contacts. Georgia and West Virginia allowed the contacts to be made over a 52-week period, Missouri required 18 contacts in a 6-week period, and New Hampshire and New Mexico required the 24 contacts to be completed within 4 weeks. One permitted variation is that the job search period may be continuous or separated into two or more parts. Approximately half of the States employed a continuous job search period. Only three States reported separate 4-week periods: Georgia, West Virginia, and the Virgin Islands. Sixteen States reported that job search was either continuous or separate, depending on geographic location or an individual's needs (see appendix table B.11).

States also differ as to how frequently registrants are required to report job search contacts, what items they are required to report, and agency practices in confirming contacts. Thirty States required contact reports every 4 weeks, or twice during the job search period; two States required reports only once every 8 weeks; and eight States varied reporting requirements according to individual circumstances. For example, a registrant with good job leads might be allowed to report less often while awaiting a job offer from an employer. (See appendix table B.12 for individual State responses.)

The contracts between FNS and the States specify the information to be provided in job search contact reports. States implement these requirements fairly uniformly: 39 States required the name of the employer, 33 the name of the

employer contact person, 37 the date of the contact, and 36 the result of the contact. Twenty States also required other information, such as the job title of the position for which the registrant applied. (See appendix table B.12.)

FNS contracts require States to contact employers and confirm a minimum of one contact for each registrant; 11 States limited their verification activities to the minimum. Four States confirm all contacts, 22 States confirm more than one contact but not all, and 3 States reported other confirmation practices. These included random verification of a sample of contacts and investigation of any contact reports that appear questionable. (See appendix table B.12).

D. SUMMARY

The organization of the work registration/job search function follows two basic patterns: direct operation by the Food Stamp Agency or subcontracted operation by the State Job Service. The approaches and services offered as part of the work registration/job search program vary substantially across the States. These types of variations were permitted under the existing program, and they are encouraged under the Food Security Act of 1985. However, the only specific service reported widely was short-term job search training, and 23 States reported job development activities. Enforcement of the job search requirement was much more uniform, as required in the job search contracts, and generally consisted of requiring 24 contacts within an 8-week period and requiring contact reports twice during this period.

IV. REPORTING

Job Search activity reporting has been a continuing concern of FNS throughout the operation of the job search program. Required items in FY 1986 were the numbers referred for assessment, assessed, job ready, entered job search, placed or employed, noncompliant, and disqualified for noncompliance. Reporting completeness for the required items has been a problem in some States and some years, with States unable to report one or more of the items. Consistency also has been a concern. One or two States have reported more registrants assessed than referred.

Numerous complexities in client flows that are potential causes of reporting problems have been described in the literature.^{3/} First, agencies typically report average caseload data for their programs, while the job search program requires tracking individuals on a cumulative basis. Second, in past years, reporting definitions may not have been clear. Third, and most important, the actual client flow is much more complex than is reflected in the reporting requirements.

For example, registrants who do not report for a scheduled assessment within 10 days are sent a follow-up letter. Registrants can further delay assessment by reporting circumstances such as family problems, illness, car problems, or job interviews that temporarily prevent them from participating. Yet they cannot be assigned to Category II Non-Job-Ready until they are assessed. There is no reporting category for "registrants pending assessment." Registrants assigned to Category II for reasons such as temporary layoff may, after 60 days, be reclassified as Category I Job Ready and assigned to job search. There is no reporting category for "successfully completed job search requirement this year without getting a job," making it difficult to reconcile entries into job search with positive (employment) and negative (noncompliance) job search outcomes. Finally, the communication and transfer of information between the eligibility staff and the job search staff may lead to backlogs of registrants awaiting service, or noncompliance awaiting determinations for adverse action.

^{3/}See, for example, Leonard Hausman, et.al., Food Stamp Work Registration and Job Search Demonstration, Final Report on Contract No. 53-33198-0-85 for the Office of Analysis and Evaluation, Food and Nutrition Service, prepared by Brandeis University and Abt Associates, July 1986, especially pp. 67-91 for a description of issues involved in tracking participants.

The goals of this section of the census were to identify the reporting procedures used, to find out what methods were used to tabulate and summarize the data, and to attempt to isolate the causes of any apparent inconsistencies or incompleteness in the data. In preparation for the census, data reported by the States for the period October 1985 through February 1986 were compiled from reports filed with FNS. States were asked to describe their reporting and tabulation procedures in detail, and then to discuss the possible causes and potential solutions to any reporting problems.

A. TABULATION PROCEDURES

State data tabulation procedures were documented in four steps. For each of the six reporting items, States were asked: (1) at what level the participant records were initially tabulated; (2) how the tabulation was performed; (3) how the State totals were prepared; and (4) how the year-to-date cumulative totals were prepared. The responses are summarized in table IV.1 (Appendix tables B.13 through B.18 show individual State responses.)

The initial tabulations of records for all reporting categories were performed at the local level in most States because, as will be shown below, most tabulation is manual. Six States tabulated referral data from food stamp program records at the State level, while four States tabulated assessment, job search, placed/employed, and noncompliance data at the State level.^{4/}

Disqualifications were tabulated at the State level in 10 States. Not surprisingly, most States tabulated the data manually each month from case records. For disqualifications, 16 States used computer tabulation, as compared with 10 to 12 States for the other items.

^{4/} Prior to FY 1983, the States using the Job Service as a subcontractor could have used the Job Service's reporting system to tabulate these services. However, that capability was deleted from the Federal reporting system when the WR/JS program was transferred to FNS.

TABLE IV.1

SUMMARY OF TABULATION PROCEDURES

Question	Referred	Assessed	Job Search	Placed/ Employed	Non- Compliance	Disqualified
3.01.01 <u>Level Tabulated</u>						
Local/County	34	36	36	36	35	30
State	6	4	4	4	4	10
Other	0	0	0	0	1	0
3.01.02 <u>How tabulated</u>						
Computer	12	11	11	10	11	16
By Hand	28	29	29	30	29	24
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
3.01.03 <u>State totals</u>						
Computer Case Records	7	7	7	6	7	13
Hand Case Records	3	3	3	3	3	2
Sum from local	30	30	30	31	30	25
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
3.01.04 <u>Year to date</u>						
Transactions	34	34	34	34	34	34
Individuals	6	6	6	6	6	6
3.01.05 <u>Case Management Computerized</u>						
Yes	15	15	15	16	14	22
No	24	25	25	24	26	18
Other	1	0	0	0	0	0
3.01.06 <u>Extent of computerization</u>						
Statistical reports	6	4	4	5	4	9
Batch listings	0	1	1	1	1	5
On line entry/query	9	10	10	10	9	8

State totals were summarized from local totals in 30 States for most items, while 13 States used computer case records to prepare counts of statewide disqualifications. Three States reported tallying the data by hand from case records at the State level. Year-to-date totals were prepared in 34 States by adding the current month's data to the previous total. Six States add only new participants to the previous total, providing an unduplicated count of individual participants. While the unduplicated counts would not differ by much from transactions counts for most types of participants, individuals who move on and off food stamps more than once during the course of the year would be overcounted in the summary of transactions.

To provide a basis for assessing States' potential capability of increasing the degree of automated reporting, those having job search contracts were asked whether any of their case management functions were computerized and, if so, to what extent. Between 14 and 16 States had some degree of computerization of their case records for the referral and service functions, and 22 had computerized disqualification information.

Some of these computer systems are used only for statistical reporting, while those in 8 to 10 States provide a broader range of functions, including online data and query functions. Comparing the number of States using computers for data tabulation with the number that have computerized some functions, it appears that three to six more States could in principle computerize their reporting, and some reported that they are in the process of doing so. Computerization alone, however, would not necessarily resolve all reporting problems, as will be shown below.

B. FORMS AND DEFINITIONS

Some reporting problems may arise from the absence of appropriate forms for recording activities or from differing definitions. To address these issues, States were asked to identify the forms used in each step of the job search program, and to describe when and how often each registrant is counted for each activity.

Referral Reporting

Seven States count a registrant at the time of a new certification (including renewal after a break in service), while 32 count both every new certification and every recertification. This practice may overstate the number of referrals potentially subject to job search, since many able-bodied NPA recipients have short certification periods but are only required to perform job search once a year. Additionally, in many States the assessment functions are performed by a separate job search unit or a subcontractor who does not have access to case records. This practice may also result in generation of notices of noncompliance for recertified registrants who cannot be sanctioned for noncompliance. (See appendix table B.19 for individual State responses.)

Ten States reported that recipients are referred only once every 12 months, 18 States said they refer at every application or break in certification, and 7 reported that they refer registrants at every eligibility review or recertification. The remaining States gave other answers that more precisely defined the conditions under which referrals were made, such as referring work registrants to job search at least every 6 months. (See appendix table B.20 for individual State responses.)

Reporting procedures in 36 States further compound this problem by counting referrals every time they are made. Only four States have the ability to count registrants once a year. Thus, the number of work registrants subject to job search requirements on penalty of disqualification is overcounted in most States.

The final question concerning the reporting of referrals deals with voluntary participation. Under the Food Security Act, any recipient is allowed to receive job search services voluntarily even if exempt. In the census, 22 States reported that exempts are allowed to volunteer for these services, while 18 States said they are not allowed to volunteer. Reasons given for denying exempts the right to volunteer included a desire to target scarce resources to those required to participate or to avoid noncompliance and adverse actions proceedings against recipients who are not subject to sanctions. Some States had no means of determining who was a mandatory registrant and who was a volunteer.

Assessment

Exempts who volunteer for job search (in the 22 States where this is allowed) are counted as assessed; however, no data were available on their number. Registrants are counted

as assessed the first time each year in 4 States, every time in 16 States, and on another basis in 2 States. (See appendix table B.21).

Entered Job Search

Registrants are counted as having entered job search when they are assigned to this component after assessment in 36 of the States, while 3 count them only after part or all of the job search is completed. In 18 States, all job-ready registrants are counted as having entered job search. (See appendix table B.22.) Some States gave reasons why job-ready registrants might not get counted as work registrants. (See appendix table B.23.) These reasons are summarized as follows:

- employed part-time (7 States);
- enrolled in training (5 States);
- search delayed with good cause (14 States);
- failed to comply without good cause (10 States);
- no longer on food stamps (9 States); and
- other (11 States).

However, no State reported that any of these reasons would affect a large number of cases. Registrants entering job search are counted every time they enter job search in 35 of the States.

Employed

Respondents were queried about their procedures for counting employment outcomes of registrants. One objective of these questions was to determine whether the States have a means of measuring the number who actually enter employment. One hypothesis was that, in the 29 States with Job Service subcontracts, those who found their own jobs might not be counted. This does not appear to be the case. Overall, in 36 States, registrants are counted as employed if they find their own jobs; in 27 States the Job Service or other subcontractor may also refer registrants to jobs.

One set of questions attempted to determine what methods the States used to find out who got a job. Job Service verification of the results of referrals to jobs and regular job search monitoring are methods used by all States. Due to a problem in the questions, however, only 16 States actually said they used them. Information collected at eligibility review was used by 19 States, and that collected at reapplication was used by 20 States. Sixteen States used wage record matches to find out about employment.

Eight States reported other methods. Special followups were reported by 16 States using in-person interviews in FSA offices, 17 reported using mail followups, 22 reported telephone followups, and 6 reported other methods. Participants entering employment were counted every time by 33 States, the first time by 5 States, and on another basis by 2 States.

C. NONCOMPLIANCE AND DISQUALIFICATION

Reported noncompliance and disqualification rates always cause concern, because the number of disqualifications averages about one-fourth the number reported in noncompliance. In the census, 39 States reported that both noncompliance and disqualification are reported every time a registrant fails to comply with registration, assessment, or job search procedures, or is disqualified for failure to comply.

As noted above, there are several programmatic reasons why a noncompliant registrant would not be disqualified. Chief among these are that the registrant had already complied at least once during the year, or that the registrant is no longer receiving food stamps when the food stamp eligibility unit receives the notice of noncompliance. Since most noncompliance is passive (i.e., the registrant fails to report as scheduled or repeatedly delays appointments, rather than refusing to comply outright), the lag between the time a registrant first fails to comply and the time a notice of adverse action is generated can be substantial.

The census attempted to measure procedural reasons why noncompliance might not result in disqualification. States were asked how often notices of noncompliance are sent to and received by the income maintenance unit. (See appendix table B.24 for individual State responses.) Reports are received daily in 18 States, weekly in 4, monthly in 1, and on no specific schedule or on another schedule in 17 States. In most of these 17 States, noncompliance notices are sent continually by the work registration unit as they are generated. In sum, this means that eligibility units in about 39 of the States receive notices no less than weekly. Typical descriptions of these procedures were: "We do it when it happens, daily"; "We send the form on one-day mail or hand carry it"; and "We definitely get it there within the necessary 5 days."

The notices of noncompliance are reviewed for action somewhat less often. Sixteen States review them daily or weekly, 2

monthly, and 22 on no specific schedule or another schedule. No State reported holding noncompliance notices until recertification or reapplication. (See appendix table B.25 for individual State responses.) However, State comments suggest that they do not know how frequently eligibility staff review the noncompliance notices. One large State said, "When they come from [the ES] they should be assigned to someone on the eligibility staff. We think it will improve." Another said, "We have a lot of trouble with that. We have 20 days to return it to [the ES], but there is no specific schedule."

One State gave an extensive description of the operational problems in noncompliance and disqualification discovered during a special review:

"Some people were not certified and should not have received notices of noncompliance. The final date of the notice has to occur during the certification period. [Some offices] receive a noncompliance notice, call the client in and find out the person is now exempt, in school, has a new child, etc. We are trying to firm up on noncompliance notices, make [eligibility] workers do something and document it, and follow-up on noncompliance notices."

D. SPECIFIC REPORTING PROBLEMS

For each State, the census interviewers referred to activity data reported for the period October 1985 through the latest report available, usually February 1986. If there was an unusual pattern in the data, the State was asked to discuss any known reasons for the pattern. If not, the State was probed to identify any reporting issues known to them.

The kinds of patterns about which specific questions were asked included: (1) reports in which the numbers referred to assessment assessed found job ready and entered job search

Responses were coded into the following categories:

- case records do not contain data (0 States);
- record system does not retain data (2 States);
- staff training is needed (2 States);
- computer tabulation needs correction (2 States);
- breakdown in information flows (4 States);
- report definitions are unclear (2 States); and
- other problems (22 States).

Clearly, the hypothesized reasons precoded in the instrument did not account for a large number of cases. One State simply did not know they needed to report referrals to assessment differently from the number assigned to job search. A State with a low number of placements reported that they could not count employment "... unless a client gets a job within an 8-week period."^{5/} This State also reported that they have a large number of noncompliance "...because clients are not returning to offices when they get a job, and they fail to report that they got a job." However, the State also reported using computerized wage record cross-matches, verification of referrals, and information collected at eligibility reviews and reapplications to follow up on entered employments.

One State whose reporting is fully computerized gave the following problem description:

"The number for entered employment is higher [than the number job ready] because of carry-over. The number disqualified is higher [than the number noncompliance] because of carry-over. Because of carry-over, it is hard to know actual activity for a particular month. If I want to know what's happening in a particular month, I can ask one of the caseworkers. However, most of the regular reporting comes from a computer list, and this list has information carried over from a previous month."

^{5/}The standard language in the FNS job search contract with the States said: "... to be counted as a placement, the job must be secured between the time of the registrant's referral and 30 days after the completion of either the 8-week job search period or a shorter job search where the full period has been split."

Another State also reported that carry-over was a cause of inconsistencies, but did not attribute it to any particular source.

These specific examples and others suggest that activity reports received by FNS are often confusing because States expend little effort in reporting system design and implementation. One State had not noticed that its reported disqualifications were larger than its reported noncompliances. Although a content analysis of source documents and tabulation forms was not conducted, a review of the tabulation forms used in some States showed a variety of terms and data items that were only partly consistent with the FNS reporting categories. Some of these forms also collected additional information, such as "returned to the FSA for redetermination of exemption," while some forms omitted key information such as number assessed.

E. SUMMARY

The reporting of job search activity has been a continuing concern of FNS. Accurate reports will be much more important in the new programs under the Food Security Act of 1985, because data on work registrants will be used to allocate funds. In addition, States will be required to meet performance standards on the minimum number of eligible participants and applicants that States must place in employment and training programs.

The census results suggest that there are two distinct sources for the discrepancies and inconsistencies in reporting. One derives from States adopting differing definitions for tabulation of job search activity. In other employment and training programs (such as JTPA, WIN, and Job Service), reporting terms, definitions, and forms are prescribed in much more detail than has been the case in this job search program. (In recent years, however, the emphasis on State control of programs and paperwork reduction has substantially reduced the scope of required reports.) This problem is relatively easy to address from a technical reporting perspective.

The second source of problems is the inherently complex operational structure and flow of the job search and the new employment and training programs. The problems derive from the

time and steps required in the food stamp certification process; the nature of exemptions; the interunit or interagency steps involved in referral for assessment and tracking noncompliance; and the self-initiated, self-supervised nature of registrant job search. In contrast, programs such as WIN or JTPA have defined enrollments with defined activities for defined time periods, and are operated under the authority of a single agency. The job search program covered in this census and the future food stamp employment and training programs are much more complex organizationally. They require more coordination to be effective in placing participants into employment and in terminating benefits to those who fail to comply.

The reporting issues particularly affect the measurement of work registrants and program enrollment in the new program. Many States were unable to give accurate reports of work registrants under the current program, most States counted registrants and referrals every time they registered during the course of a year, and it was not clear how many States were able to limit counts of referrals only to those required to register. Resolution of these issues will be important for resource allocation and implementation of performance standards.

V. FUTURE PROGRAMS

The passage of the Food Security Act of 1985 ushers in a new era of employment and training programs for nonexempt food stamp recipients. The regulations for the program were issued for comment in October 1986, and the statutory implementation date for the program is April 1, 1987. In addition to the job search activities that have been authorized in the past, the new law authorizes applicant job search (as distinct from recipient job search), job search training, work experience and training, workfare, coordination with other programs, and payment of participant expenses. Funds will be allocated to the States proportional to the number of work registrants, and all States will be required to operate programs--in contrast to the individual State contracts used to fund the current program. Finally, States will be required to meet performance standards that specify the minimum percentage of nonexempt work registrants that must be served.

All 53 State agencies were asked to describe what new directions they might take under the new program. Most of the responses were very preliminary and tentative, since neither the regulations nor the State funding levels had been established. However, States did respond with program descriptions that may be pertinent to future implementation.

A. EXPANSION PRIORITIES AND TARGETING

State priorities for program expansion are provided in appendix table B.26. This table shows that 46 State agencies plan to expand programs under the new law, subject to funding levels and regulations. The States not planning to expand either already have statewide programs or expressed reservations about the level of funding and service requirements. Priorities for geographic expansion, in order of frequency mentioned, were good job markets (27 States), large caseloads (23), coordination with other programs (22), and concentration of job-ready cases (12). In addition, 12 States gave "other" responses. Some of these were:

- We will have to wait and see how much money we get.
- We want to run more people through the system, stop the creaming that exists now, and take those that express a real interest in job search.
- It depends on the regulations.

- We need to gear the program toward success, negotiate with employers to get spaces for more placements.

States were asked about the types of cases they would target. NPA cases would be targeted in 16 States, while 30 States would include both PA and NPA cases, presumably exclusive of AFDC participants in WIN programs. Virtually all States would cover both new cases and recertifications. Twenty-one States would target cases with long certification periods. The median certification period reported was 3 months, with a range of 1 to 12 months. Only eight States would target based on monthly benefit amount. (See appendix table B.27 for individual State responses.)

B. NEW PROGRAM ELEMENTS

States were asked if they would add or expand each of the newly authorized components under the new program. The following number of States responded positively to each item:

- Applicant job search (17 States);
- Job search training (45 States);
- Work experience and training (32 States);
- Workfare (13 States);
- Coordination with other programs (45 States); and
- Payment of participant expenses (40 States).

As shown above and in appendix table B.28, job search training, coordination, and payment of participant expenses would each be added or expanded in 40 or more States. Most of these States not answering "Yes" to these questions gave "Don't know" as their response. Applicant job search and workfare received only 17 and 13 "Yesses," respectively, with numerous negative comments. Work experience training would be added or expanded in 32 States.

Applicant Job Search

When asked about expanding job search activities or services for applicants, respondents were frequently negative. Only 17 States reported plans to expand services for applicants. Examples of the types of positive and negative comments are as follows:

Positive comments:

1. Cost-effective (6 States), e.g.:

"The most cost-effective way of dealing with the situation."

2. Increases employment (4 States), e.g.:

"The sooner people get into job search, the sooner they find jobs."

3. Coordination with AFDC requirements (5 States), e.g.:

"We do this in AFDC with employment job search," and "we would be treating all people alike who meet criteria."

Negative responses:

1. Administrative cost (7 States), e.g.:

"It would involve a lot of time for people who would never be approved for food stamps."

2. Client hardship (4 States), e.g.:

"If a person is hungry and needs food, we don't want to send them out to look for work."

3. Economic conditions (2 States), e.g.:

"People are on and off [food stamps], a lot of employment is seasonal."

Job Search
Training

Most States (45) would add or expand job search training, but eight were not sure. Many States (20) emphasized the importance of job search skills, e.g., "The more information people are given about finding work, the more successful they are in finding jobs." Perceived cost effectiveness in other programs was cited by 11 States, e.g., "using job club concept; best result and high employment rate; over 50 percent get jobs."

Work
Experience
and Training

More than half of the States (32) would add or expand work experience and training. The positive comments emphasized the need for transitional employment for those out of the labor market (16 States), e.g., "we have a number of people out of work for a fairly long period of time, difficult to place without work experience and training." Six States cited positive experience in other programs, e.g., "Have had positive outcomes with AFDC work experience and training."

Negative responses cited ineffectiveness in other programs (two States), lack of jobs (two States), and general doubts about its effectiveness (four States), e.g.,: "We shy away from work experience, it's mandated in GA, unsure about its use for FS recipients."

Workfare

Workfare would be added or expanded by only 13 States in the census. Four of these described it as CWEP, and two more included work experience as the key element, e.g., "Gives client work experience, which helps when applying for jobs." Other comments from those answering "Yes" included "Some counties feel it would help keep people involved in the program"; "Useful to some clients"; and "Definitely may calculate in the value of FS."

Twelve States gave specific negative responses, concentrating on lack of cost effectiveness (six States) and punitive aspects of workfare (three States). Another State "learned that clients were not in the system long enough to work off benefits, not much work that they can do, don't learn any trade, make-work situation."

Coordination

Most States (45) would add or expand coordination with other programs to improve resource utilization, prevent duplication of services, and meet more client needs. No negative comments were received.

Payment of Participant Expenses

Most States (40) would add or expand payment of participant expenses. Three States responded negatively, citing costs or alternative uses of funds. Typical among the positive States was the following comment: "Many are now unable to participate without expenses, it will help with child care and transportation costs." In addition, however, three States questioned the adequacy of the amounts: "\$25 a month is not going to do it."

C. PROGRAM GOALS

The question concerning program goals was divided into four parts: (1) how the food stamp program fits into the State's overall employment and training strategy, (2) its important objectives, (3) the key characteristics of the program, and (4) the special characteristics that need to be taken into account.

Overall
Strategy

There was an interesting mix of responses concerning strategy. On the one hand, about 25 States emphasized increased coordination among programs, e.g., "We're looking at it as being a component of our overall program." On the other hand, 13 States mentioned the independence of the Food Stamp Program from other welfare and employment and training programs e.g., "Our overall strategy is to place people, not to train them." Seven States expressed concern about the level of funding and the effect of regulations on what they can do.

Objectives

The three objectives cited most often were providing employment (21 States), providing training and education (10 States), and promoting self-sufficiency (7 States). One State responded that their objective was "Placement into unsubsidized jobs in the private sector. The idea is to get them jobs, not scare them off food stamps."

Key Program
Characteristics

States were asked open-ended questions concerning what key program characteristics would be necessary and what special characteristics of the population would need to be taken into account in the implementation of the new program. These two questions provoked a wide variety of responses that tended to overlap substantially across the questions. Therefore, we developed a set of 11 codes and categorized the responses. The numbers of States citing each characteristic are as follows:

	<u>Program Characteristics</u>	<u>Population Characteristics</u>
Design of training and placement	21	17
Funding	19	3
Flexibility	14	2
Education	12	6
Barriers to employment	11	15
Coordination	5	5
Adequate staffing	5	1
Recognition from employers	3	0
Short certification period	0	7
Long certification period	0	2
Other	8	18

The most frequently mentioned key program characteristics were the design and implementation of training and placement services, mentioned by 21 States, and the level of funding, mentioned by 19 States. Ten or more States also mentioned

the need for flexibility in the program, the importance of education for clients, and client barriers to employment.

Regarding key participant characteristics, States focused on client barriers to employment, the design of appropriate training and placement activities to address these barriers, and other concerns (primarily the adequacy of participant reimbursements to meet the costs of travel clothing and child care).

D. SUCCESSFUL PROGRAMS

Of the States, 19 believe they have successful job search programs within their States, and another 16 States cite WIN, WIN DEMO, and related programs as being effective models for the future job search program. In addition, 20 States cited specific programs and locations that could be candidates for further assessment.

E. SUMMARY

There was extensive interest in expanding employment and training programs for food stamp recipients, and many States had begun initial planning in advance of regulations or fund allocations. Thirty States planned to include both NPA and PA cases in the expansion, with 16 States targeting NPA cases, and almost all States planned to include both new cases and recertifications. Job search training, coordination with other programs, and payment of participant expenses were most likely to be added or expanded under the new program, while applicant job search and workfare were mentioned by fewer than 20 of the States.

APPENDIX A

WORK REGISTRATION/JOB SEARCH
STATE CENSUS INSTRUMENT

MODULE 1: PROGRAM STATUS AND COVERAGE

INTERVIEWER NOTE: QUESTIONS IN THIS SECTION SHOULD BE ANSWERED INITIALLY USING THE STATE WR/JS CONTRACT AND MONTHLY REPORTS. RESPONDENTS MAY BE ASKED TO CONFIRM THE INFORMATION AND TO PROVIDE CORRECTED INFORMATION.

THE QUESTIONS BELOW SHOULD BE ASKED AS WRITTEN ONLY IF THE INFORMATION IS NOT AVAILABLE FROM THOSE SOURCES.

1.01 The first group of questions concerns work registration in (STATE).

1.01.01 For the state as a whole, what was the average monthly number of PA and NPA Food Stamp households during the period October 1, 1985 to February 28, 1986?

PA CASES....., ,
NPA CASES....., ,
TOTAL....., ,

1.01.02 For the state as a whole, what was the number of work registrants in the state for the period October 1, 1985 through February 28, 1986?

NUMBER....., ,

1.02 In which counties in your state does each of the following programs operate?

Food Stamp Job Search?
AFDC WIN?
AFDC WIN Demo?
Food Stamp Workfare?
Other employment and training program for FS recipients?
(DESCRIBE) _____

INTERVIEWER: Record on attached list of counties by circling all that apply.

PREFILL COUNTIES

PAGE ____ OF ____

Food Stamp Job Search?.....	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
AFDC WIN?.....	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
AFDC WIN Demo?.....	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Food Stamp Workfare?.....	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Other employment and training program for FS recipients?..... (DESCRIBE)	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
_____ __ 	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
_____ __ 	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
_____ __ 	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
_____ __ 	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
_____ __ 	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1

1.03 Does (STATE) have a job search contract with FNS for federal fiscal year 1986?

YES.....1
NO.....(GO TO MODULE 4).....0

1.04 Who is subject to the Food Stamp job search? Is it targetted to serve specific groups such as:

	YES	NO
NPA cases only?.....1	1	0
Both PA and NPA?.....1	1	0
Other.....1	1	0
(SPECIFY) _____		

1.05 Is the job search coverage statewide; that is, do all areas in the state participate in the job search program?

YES.....(GO TO 1.09).....1
NO.....0

1.06 What were the most important criteria used to select areas for participation in the job search program? (CIRCLE "1" FOR ALL THAT APPLY.)

LARGE FOOD STAMP CASELOAD.....1
GOOD JOB MARKETS.....1
HIGH CONCENTRATIONS OF HH WITH HIGH FS ALLOTMENTS.....1
HIGH CONCENTRATIONS OF HH WITH CERTIFICATION PERIODS EXCEEDING TWO MONTHS.....1
HIGH CONCENTRATION OF JOB READY CASES.....1
ABSENCE OF FOOD STAMP WORKFARE OR OTHER FOOD STAMP JOB SEARCH DEMONSTRATION.....1
COORDINATION WITH OTHER PROGRAM OR DEMONSTRATION.....1
(DESCRIBE) _____

COUNTY/LOCAL PREFERENCE.....1
OTHER1
(SPECIFY) _____

1.07 In the areas covered by job search, what was the average monthly number of PA and NPA Food Stamp households during the period October 1, 1985 to February 28, 1986?

PA CASES.....|_|_|_|, |_|_|_|
NPA CASES.....|_|_|_|, |_|_|_|
TOTAL.....|_|_|_|, |_|_|_|

1.08 What was the number of work registrants in areas covered by Job Search for the period October 1, 1985 to February 28, 1986?

|_|_|_|, |_|_|_|

1.09 What was the number of work registrants in each of the following categories for the period October 1, 1985 through February 28, 1986?

Registrants referred to assessment?..|_|_|_|, |_|_|_|

Registrants assessed to be:

Category I - Job Ready?.....|_|_|_|, |_|_|_|

Category II - Non-Job Ready?.....|_|_|_|, |_|_|_|

Category III - Exempt?.....|_|_|_|, |_|_|_|

Registrants entered job search?.....|_|_|_|, |_|_|_|

Registrants placed (or entered employment)?.....|_|_|_|, |_|_|_|

Registrants found noncompliant?.....|_|_|_|, |_|_|_|

Registrants disqualified?.....|_|_|_|, |_|_|_|

1.10.01 What are the total dollars the state Food Stamp Agency received from FNS for the job search function in FY 1986?

DOLLARS.....|_|, |_|_|_|, |_|_|_|

1.10.02 How many full-time-equivalent (FTE) staff does this FNS funding provide in FY 1986?

FTE STAFF.....|_|_|_|

1.10.03 Is any part of the job search function being subcontracted in FY 1986 to any other agency?

YES.....1

NO.....(GO TO 1.10.05).....0

1.10.04 What agency performs these subcontracted functions? (CIRCLE "1" FOR ALL THAT APPLY.)

IF CIRCLED, ASK--

How much money
do they receive?

How many FTE staff
does this pay for?

JOB SERVICE.....1 ☐ , ☐☐☐ , ☐☐☐ ☐☐☐☐

JTPA.....1 ☐ , ☐☐☐ , ☐☐☐ ☐☐☐☐

OTHER.....1 ☐ , ☐☐☐ , ☐☐☐ ☐☐☐☐

(SPECIFY) _____ ☐☐☐

1.10.05 Does any other agency or funding source provide additional funding or staff for the job search function in FY 1986?

YES.....1

NO.....(GO TO MODULE 2).....0

1.10.06 What agency or funding source provides these extra resources?
(CIRCLE "1" FOR ALL THAT APPLY.)

IF CIRCLED, ASK--

How much money
do they provide?

How many FTE staff
does this pay for?

JOB SERVICE.....1 ☐☐☐☐ , ☐☐☐☐ ☐☐☐☐☐

JTPA.....1 ☐☐☐☐ , ☐☐☐☐ ☐☐☐☐☐

OTHER.....1 ☐☐☐☐ , ☐☐☐☐ ☐☐☐☐☐

(SPECIFY) _____ ☐☐☐

MODULE 2: PROGRAM FUNCTIONS

2.00 The questions in this section collect information about the manner in which job search activities are organized. We will cover what agencies perform what functions and the content of the services.

The functions we want to review are:

Referral for assessment. That is, referral to the job search provider in order to be assessed for job readiness.

Assessment and assignment. That is, an interview and assignment by the job search provider to a job search category.

Job search monitoring. That is, administering the job search requirement and assisting registrants in their job search.

Employment. That is, registrant obtaining a job during the job search period or within 30 days after the end of the period.

Notification of failure to comply. That is, notification of failure, without good cause, to report for a interview or to make required job search contacts.

Disqualification or denial for failure to comply. That is, termination or denial of benefits because registrant failed, without good cause, to comply with job search requirements.

NOTE: ASK SET OF
QUESTIONS FOR ONE
FUNCTION AT A TIME

Referral for Assessment	Assessment and Assignment	Job Search Monitoring	Notification of Failure to Comply	Disqualification or Denial for Failure to Comply
-------------------------------	---------------------------------	-----------------------------	---	--

2.01 What staff unit performs
each job search function?

FOOD STAMP AGENCY

IM UNIT.....	1	1	1	1	1
SPECIAL WR/JS UNIT.....	2	2	2	2	2
SUBCONTRACTOR					
JOB SERVICE.....	3	3	3	3	3
OTHER.....	4	4	4	4	4
(SPECIFY).....	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
	___	___	___	___	___

2.02.01 How are assessments conducted?

INDIVIDUALLY.....1
IN GROUPS.....2
OTHER.....3
(SPECIFY)_____

2.02.02 How long does it usually take to conduct an assessment?

MINUTES.....

2.03.01 Is any job search counseling or training provided separately from the
assessment?

YES.....1
NO.....(GO TO 2.04.01).....0

2.03.02 How is this provided?

INDIVIDUALLY.....1
IN GROUPS.....2
IN JOB CLUB.....3
OTHER.....4
(DESCRIBE)_____

2.03.03 How many days and how many hours per day is this scheduled to last?

DAYS.....|_|_|

HOURS PER DAY.....|_|_|

2.03.04 Is this voluntary or mandatory?

VOLUNTARY.....1

MANDATORY.....2

2.03.05 How many persons have participated in the period October 1, 1985, through February 28, 1986?

NUMBER.....|_|_|, |_|_|_|

2.04.01 Does your state include any of the following program components or functions as part of the job search activities in the current program year (FY 1986)?

	<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>	<u>DK</u>	IF YES, ASK - How many persons have participated October 1, 1985 through February 28, 1986?
a. Referral to Jobs?.....1	2	-1	_ _ , _ _ _	
b. Job Development?.....1	2	-1	_ _ , _ _ _	
c. FS Workfare?.....1	2	-1	_ _ , _ _ _	
d. Classroom training?.....1	2	-1	_ _ , _ _ _	
e. On-the-job training?.....1	2	-1	_ _ , _ _ _	
f. Or any other components?...1	2	-1	_ _ , _ _ _	
(SPECIFY)_____			_ _	

2.04.02 IF YES TO CLASSROOM TRAINING, ASK--What types of training are provided?

REMEDIAL EDUCATION.....1

SKILL TRAINING.....2

BOTH.....3

2.04.03 IF YES TO CLASSROOM TRAINING, ASK--How many weeks does the typical class last?

WEEKS.....|_|_|

2.05.01 How many job search contacts are registrants required to make?

NUMBER.....|_|_|

2.05.02 How many weeks is the job search period?

NUMBER.....|_|_|

2.05.03 Is this period continuous for all cases, divided into two separate periods for all cases, or does this vary for some cases?

CONTINUOUS FOR ALL.....(GO TO 2.06.01).....1

SEPARATE FOR ALL.....(GO TO 2.06.01).....2

VARIES.....3

2.05.04 For most cases, is it continuous or is it separate?

CONTINUOUS.....1

SEPARATE.....2

2.05.05 For what type of cases does it vary?

TYPE OF CASE

2.06.01 How often are registrants required to report job search contacts?

EVERY 4 WEEKS.....1
EVERY 8 WEEKS.....2
VARIES.....3
PROBE: (How does this vary?)

_____|||

2.06.02 What items are registrants required to report? (CIRCLE "1" OR "0"
FOR ALL ITEMS.)

YES NO

NAME OF EMPLOYERS CONTACTED.....1 0
NAME OF CONTACT PERSON.....1 0
DATE OF CONTACT.....1 0
RESULT OF CONTACT.....1 0
OTHER.....1 0

(SPECIFY) _____|||

2.06.03 Does the agency confirm contacts with employers for all cases or are
there some types of cases for which they do not confirm contacts?

CONFIRM ALL.....(GO TO MODULE 3).....1
SOME.....2
MINIMUM REQUIREMENT OF ONE.....3

2.06.04 For what type of cases are employers contacted?

TYPE OF CASE

_____|_|_|
_____|_|_|
_____|_|_|
_____|_|_|

MODULE 3: REPORTING

3.01 We want to learn about how information is tabulated into reports for FNS. Report preparation involves three distinct steps: initial tabulation from source records, (2) aggregation of tabulations to state totals, and (3) aggregation to year-to-date totals.

NOTE: ASK SET OF
QUESTIONS FOR ONE
FUNCTION AT A TIME

Referred	Assessed	Entered Job Search	Placed/ Employed	Noncompliant	Disqualified
----------	----------	--------------------------	---------------------	--------------	--------------

3.01.01 At what level are participant records initially tabulated?

LOCAL/COUNTY LEVEL.....	1	1	1	1	1	1
STATE LEVEL.....	2	2	2	2	2	2
OTHER.....	3	3	3	3	3	3
(SPECIFY).....	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
	_ _	_ _	_ _	_ _	_ _	_ _

3.01.02 How is the tabulation performed?
Is it by computer from case
records or is it by hand?

BY COMPUTER.....	1	1	1	1	1	1
BY HAND.....	2	2	2	2	2	2
OTHER.....	3	3	3	3	3	3
(SPECIFY).....	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
	<u> </u> <u> </u>	<u> </u> <u> </u>	<u> </u> <u> </u>	<u> </u> <u> </u>	<u> </u> <u> </u>	<u> </u> <u> </u>

3.01.03 How are the final state totals prepared?

BY COMPUTER FROM CASE						
RECORDS.....	1	1	1	1	1	1
BY HAND FORM CASE						
RECORDS.....	2	2	2	2	2	2
SUMMARIZED FROM LOCAL/						
COUNTY TOTALS.....	3	3	3	3	3	3
OTHER.....	4	4	4	4	4	4

3.01.04 How are the year-to-date cumulative totals prepared?

ALL TRANSACTIONS IN CURRENT PERIOD ARE ADDED TO THE PREVIOUS TOTAL.....

THE NUMBER OF NEW PARTICIPANTS
IN CURRENT PERIOD IS ADDED
TO PREVIOUS TOTAL.....

NOTE: ASK SET OF
QUESTIONS FOR ONE
FUNCTION AT A TIME

Referred	Assessed	Entered Job Search	Placed/ Employed	Noncompliant	Disqualified
----------	----------	--------------------------	---------------------	--------------	--------------

3.01.05 Are any of the case management
or participant tracking
activities for this function
computerized?

YES.....	1	1	1	1	1
NO..(GO TO NEXT FUNCTION)....	0	0	0	0	0

3.01.06 To what extent are these
activities computerized?

STATISTICAL REPORTING ONLY...	1	1	1	1	1
BATCH LISTINGS/ROSTERS ARE PROVIDED.....	2	2	2	2	2
ONLINE ENTRY/QUERY IS POSSIBLE.....	3	3	3	3	3
OTHER.....	4	4	4	4	4
(DESCRIBE).....					

□□	□□	□□	□□	□□	□□
----	----	----	----	----	----

The next set of questions is about the definition of items in reports on job search activities and what forms you use to collect the data.

3.02 The first term is Referred.
(THIS IS DEFINED AS REFERRAL FROM THE INCOME MAINTENANCE UNIT TO THE
JOB SEARCH PROVIDER IN ORDER TO BE ASSESSED FOR JOB READINESS.)

3.02.01 What is the name and number of the form you use to record this
information?

a. NAME: _____

b. FORM NUMBER|_|_|_|_|_|_|_|

3.02.02 Is a registrant counted as referred when he or she is a new
certification, a recertification, or both?

NEW CERTIFICATION.....1

RECERTIFICATION.....2

BOTH.....3

OTHER.....4

(SPECIFY) _____|_|_|

3.02.03 How often do you refer nonexempt recipients for assessment?

ONLY ONCE EACH 12 MONTHS.....1

AT EVERY APPLICATION OR BREAK IN CERTIFICATION.....2

AT EVERY ELIGIBILITY REVIEW/RECERTIFICATION.....3

OTHER.....4

(SPECIFY) _____|_|_|

3.02.04 Is the registrant counted only the first time referred each fiscal year or every time?

FIRST TIME.....1

EVERY TIME.....2

OTHER.....3

(SPECIFY) _____|_|_|

3.02.05 Are exempts allowed to volunteer for job search?

YES.....1

NO.....0

3.03 The next term is Assessed.
(THIS IS DEFINED AS HAVING BEEN INTERVIEWED BY THE JOB SEARCH PROVIDER TO DETERMINE THE REGISTRANT'S JOB SEARCH CATEGORY.)

3.03.01 What is the name and number of the form you use to record this information?

a. NAME : _____

b. FORM NUMBER.....|_|_|_|_|_|_|_|

3.03.02 Are exempts who volunteer for job search counted as assessed?

YES.....1

NO.....0

3.03.03 Is the registrant counted only the first time assessed each fiscal year or every time?

FIRST TIME.....1

EVERY TIME.....2

OTHER.....3

(SPECIFY) _____|_|_|

3.04 The next item is Entered a Job Search.
(THIS IS DEFINED AS REGISTRANTS PRESENTING THEMSELVES TO PROSPECTIVE EMPLOYERS WHO ORDINARILY EMPLOY PERSONS IN AREAS THAT MEET THE SUITABILITY REQUIREMENTS AND WHO HAVE JOBS THE REGISTRANT IS REASONABLY QUALIFIED FOR BY EXPERIENCE.)

3.04.01 What is the name and number of the form you use to record this information?

a. NAME: _____

b. FORM NUMBER|_|_|_|_|_|_|_|_|_|

3.04.02 Are registrants counted as entered job search when they are assigned to job search, when they have completed part or all of their assignment, or under some other conditions?

WHEN ASSIGNED TO JOB SEARCH STATUS.....1

WHEN PART OF JOB SEARCH IS COMPLETED.....2

WHEN ALL OF JOB SEARCH IS COMPLETED.....3

OTHER.....4

(SPECIFY) _____|_|_|

3.04.03 Are all job ready registrants counted as entered job search?

YES.....(GO TO 3.04.05).....1

NO.....0

3.04.04 What are some of the most frequent reasons why job ready registrants might not be counted as entered a job search? (CIRCLE "1" FOR ALL THAT APPLY.)

EMPLOYED PART-TIME.....1
ENROLLED IN JOB TRAINING PROGRAM.....1
JOB SEARCH DELAYED WITH GOOD CAUSE.....1
FAILED TO COMPLY WITHOUT GOOD CAUSE.....1
NO JOB CONTACTS HAVE BEEN REPORTED.....1
JOB CONTACTS HAVE NOT BEEN VERIFIED.....1
THEY HAVE LEFT THE FOOD STAMP PROGRAM.....1
OTHER1
(SPECIFY) _____|_|_|

3.04.05 Is the registrant counted only the first time he or she enters job search each fiscal year or every time?

FIRST TIME.....1
EVERY TIME.....2
OTHER.....3
(SPECIFY) _____|_|_|

3.05 The next term is Employed.
(THIS IS DEFINED AS REGISTRANTS WHO HAVE OBTAINING A JOB (THROUGH THE REQUIRED JOB SEARCH, A SPECIFIC REFERRAL BY THE JOB SEARCH PROVIDER, OR THE REGISTRANT'S OWN INITIATIVE) BETWEEN THE TIME OF THE REGISTRANT'S REFERRAL AND 30 DAYS AFTER THE END OF THE JOB SEARCH PERIOD.)

3.05.01 What is the name and number of the form you use to record this information?

a. NAME: _____

b. FORM NUMBER|_|_|_|_|_|_|_|

3.05.02 Must the registrants be referred to the job by the job search contractor/subcontractor, or can they be counted if they find their own jobs?

	<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>
MUST BE REFERRED BY CONTRACTOR/SUBCONTRACTOR.....	1	0
MAY BE COUNTED IF THEY FIND OWN JOB.....	1	0
OTHER.....	1	0

(SPECIFY) _____

3.05.03 What follow-up methods are used to identify registrants who are placed or obtain employment after the last job search contact report? (CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY.)

a. Special follow-ups done by the job search provider?

YES.....	1
NO.....(GO TO C).....	0

b. How are these special follow-ups conducted? (CIRCLE "1" OR "0" FOR ALL ITEMS.)

	<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>
IN-PERSON.....	1	0
BY MAIL.....	1	0
BY TELEPHONE.....	1	0
OTHER.....	1	0

(SPECIFY) _____

c. Other follow-up methods? (CIRCLE "1" OR "0" FOR ALL ITEMS.)

	<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>
INFORMATION COLLECTED AT RECERTIFICATION.....	1	0
INFORMATION COLLECTED AT REAPPLICATION.....	1	0
WAGE RECORD CROSS MATCH.....	1	0
OTHER.....	1	0

(SPECIFY) _____

3.05.04 Is the registrant counted only the first time placed each fiscal year or every time?

FIRST TIME.....	1
EVERY TIME.....	2
OTHER.....	3

(SPECIFY) _____

3.06 The next item is noncompliance.
(THIS IS DEFINED AS FAILURE, WITHOUT GOOD CAUSE, TO REPORT FOR A
SCHEDULED INTERVIEW OR FAILURE TO MAKE REQUIRED JOB SEARCH CONTACTS.)

3.06.01 What is the name and number of the form you use to record this
information?

a. NAME: _____

b. FORM NUMBER|_|_|_|_|_|_|_|

3.06.02 Is the registrant counted only the first time noncompliant each
fiscal year or every time?

FIRST TIME.....1

EVERY TIME.....2

OTHER.....3

(SPECIFY) _____|_|_|

3.07 The last item is disqualified for failure to comply.
(THIS IS DEFINED AS TERMINATING OR DENIAL OF BENEFITS BECAUSE
REGISTRANTS HAVE FAILED WITHOUT GOOD CAUSE TO COMPLY WITH THE JOB
SEARCH REQUIREMENTS.)

3.07.01 What is the name and number of the form you use to record this
information?

a. NAME: _____

b. FORM NUMBER:.....|_|_|_|_|_|_|_|

3.07.02 How frequently are reports of noncompliance received by the Income Maintenance Unit?

DAILY.....1
WEEKLY.....2
MONTHLY.....3
NO SPECIFIC SCHEDULE.....6
OTHER SCHEDULE.....7
(RECORD VERBATIM)_____|||
_____|||

3.07.03 How frequently are reports of noncompliance reviewed by the Income Maintenance Unit?

DAILY.....1
WEEKLY.....2
MONTHLY.....3
AT RECERTIFICATION.....4
AT REAPPLICATION.....5
NO SPECIFIC SCHEDULE.....6
OTHER SCHEDULE.....7
(RECORD VERBATIM)_____|||
_____|||

3.07.04 Is the registrant counted only the first time disqualified each fiscal year or every time?

FIRST TIME.....1
EVERY TIME.....2
OTHER.....3
(SPECIFY)_____|||

3.08 Now we would like to go over some numbers we have taken from past reports your state has submitted to FNS. First, I'll describe the numbers and then I would like you to discuss the reason for the pattern we have observed.

3.08.01 DESCRIBE THE PATTERN:

What do you think is the source or reason for this pattern? RECORD VERBATIM RESPONSE.

NOTES:

(CIRCLE "1" FOR ALL THAT APPLY.)

CASE RECORDS DO NOT CONTAIN THE INFORMATION.....1

RECORD SYSTEM (MANUAL OR COMPUTER) DOES NOT
RETAIN INFORMATION IN A FORM SUITABLE FOR TABULATION.....1

STAFF TRAINING IS NEEDED TO CORRECT PROBLEMS.....1

COMPUTER TABULATION ROUTINES NEED CORRECTION.....1

THERE IS A BREAKDOWN IN THE INFORMATION FLOW
AMONG AGENCIES OR UNITS.....1

FNS REPORT DEFINITIONS ARE UNCLEAR.....1

OTHER.....1

(SPECIFY) _____

MODULE 4: FUTURE PROGRAMS

- 4.00 The Food Security Act of 1985 authorizes several new or modified program elements. We would like your opinions about how effective you think these program elements would be in your state. Please draw on your observations of or experiences with similar program elements in other assistance programs such as AFDC, WIN, Unemployment Insurance, or General Assistance, both in your state and other states.

The first questions are about what your priorities would be if your state were to expand employment and training programs under the new law.

- 4.01 Under the new law, would you expect to expand any of your Food Stamp work registration, job search, or employment and training programs?

YES.....1

NO.....0

- 4.02 (If you were to expand your program,) what criteria would you use to select new geographic areas for participation in the program?
(CIRCLE "1" FOR ALL THAT APPLY.)

LARGE FOOD STAMP CASELOAD.....1

GOOD JOB MARKETS.....1

HIGH CONCENTRATIONS OF HH WITH HIGH FS ALLOTMENTS.....1

HIGH CONCENTRATIONS OF HH WITH CERTIFICATION
PERIODS EXCEEDING TWO MONTHS.....1

HIGH CONCENTRATION OF JOB READY CASES.....1

ABSENCE OF WORKFARE OR OTHER DEMONSTRATION.....1

COORDINATION WITH OTHER PROGRAM OR DEMONSTRATION.....1

(DESCRIBE) _____

_____|_|_|
COUNTY/LOCAL PREFERENCE.....1

OTHER.....1

(SPECIFY) _____

_____|_|_|

4.03 (If you were to expand your program,) what kinds of cases would you target? Would you target:

- a. PA cases?.....1
- NPA cases?.....2
- or both?.....3
- b. New cases?.....1
- Recertification cases?.....2
- or both?.....3
- c. Cases with certification periods longer than a defined number of months?
YES.....1
NO.....(GO TO 4.03e).....0
- d. How many months would that be?
MONTHS.....|_|_|
- e. Cases with monthly benefits greater than a defined number of dollars?
YES.....1
NO.....(GO TO 4.04).....0
- f. What size of monthly benefit would that be?
DOLLARS.....|_|, |_|_|_|

4.04 What activities or services would you add or expand? Would you add or expand:

YES NO

- a. Applicant job search?.....1 0
- IF YES, ASK--Why do you say that?

YES NO
b. Job search training?.....1 0

IF YES, ASK--Why do you say that?

YES NO
c. Work experience and training?.....1 0

IF YES, ASK--Why do you say that?

YES NO
d. Workfare?.....1 0

IF YES, ASK--Why do you say that?

YES NO
e. Coordination with other programs?.....1 0

IF YES, ASK--Why do you say that?

YES NO
f. Payment of participant expenses?.....1 0

IF YES, ASK--Why do you say that?

4.06.02 Given this position on the overall strategy, what do you see as the most important objectives for the Food Stamp work program?

NOTES:

4.06.03 What key characteristics do you think the Food Stamp work program needs in order to meet these objectives?

NOTES:

4.06.04 What special characteristics of the Food Stamp program and Food Stamp recipients must be taken into account in designing and operating an effective work program?

NOTES:

4.07 Do you know an example of a particularly successful job search program in your state? IF YES, ASK--What makes it successful? IF NO, ASK--In other states?

NOTES:

4.08 Which programs in your own state would you nominate for intensive assessment during the next phase of this study?

NOTES:

APPENDIX B

APPENDIX TABLE B.1
COVERED CASELOAD
AS A PERCENT OF STATEWIDE TOTAL

STATE	Public Assistance	Non-Public Assistance	Total
Alabama	46.78	46.72	46.73
Alaska	29.81	29.81	29.81
Arizona	72.28	62.63	65.07
Arkansas	49.62	41.21	42.24
California	71.12	71.12	71.12
Colorado	5.04	4.81	4.95
Delaware	100.00	100.00	100.00
Florida	90.10	87.97	88.45
Georgia	35.38	35.38	35.38
Guam	100.00	100.00	100.00
Hawaii	67.31	63.95	65.61
Idaho	40.92	40.92	40.92
Illinois	75.42	35.14	82.57
Iowa	100.00	100.00	100.00
Kansas	18.00	16.50	17.27
Kentucky	36.41	18.60	21.37
Maine	19.16	20.76	20.15
Minnesota	58.53	74.03	63.69
Mississippi	27.92	27.92	27.92
Missouri	100.00	100.00	100.00
Montana	57.06	51.81	53.82
Nebraska	12.10	11.91	11.97
Nevada	92.99	90.51	90.93
New Hampshire	54.08	53.57	53.92
New Jersey	100.00	100.00	100.00
New Mexico	100.00	100.00	100.00
New York	17.94	45.52	25.52
North Carolina	100.00	100.00	100.00
Oklahoma	47.05	42.75	44.72
Oregon	33.33	33.33	33.33
South Carolina	100.00	100.00	100.00
South Dakota	51.96	46.59	47.55
Tennessee	70.00	70.00	70.00
Texas	54.38	54.38	54.38
Vermont	3.63	14.13	10.51
Virgin Islands	100.00	100.00	100.00
Virginia	32.31	28.96	30.21
Washington	100.00	100.00	100.00
West Virginia	100.00	100.00	100.00
Wisconsin	18.22	17.50	17.99
All States	40	40	40
Average	38.22	46.33	43.16

APPENDIX TABLE B.2
AVERAGE MONTHLY PROGRAM ACTIVITY
(Q.1.09)

STATE	Referred to Assessment	Job Ready	Not Job Ready	Exempt	Entered Job Search	Entered Employment	Found Non- Compliant	Disqualified
Alabama	2829	1492	537	806	1325	558	944	158
Alaska	100	54	0	0	54	18	36	11
Arizona	1004	408	207	0	420	161	424	221
Arkansas	762	608	0	0	528	96	253	141
California	3818	1606	847	1365	1194	298	1633	318
Colorado	472	242	0	0	242	151	146	142
Delaware	349	149	0	0	144	43	192	48
Florida	6034	2228	0	0	2150	1149	1437	791
Georgia	1635	779	0	0	477	446	780	263
Guam	89	27	27	6	27	17	40	29
Hawaii	528	318	0	0	243	43	345	93
Idaho	882	385	0	64	268	66	159	98
Illinois	6753	6753	0	0	6753	565	1237	999
Iowa	2698	1615	0	0	1117	149	743	199
Kansas	393	163	30	38	163	46	85	64
Kentucky	1821	972	847	2	972	52	103	103
Maine	132	59	0	0	55	36	29	19
Minnesota	1371	826	0	0	777	138	476	284
Mississippi	1113	513	256	128	513	112	236	209
Missouri	6132	6079	42	10	354	160	34	42
Montana	321	190	15	0	185	81	203	52
Nebraska	227	227	1	0	186	45	66	53
Nevada	1136	446	43	20	499	309	656	445
New Hampshire	228	140	0	0	129	45	44	21
New Jersey	567	311	0	0	243	42	126	89

CONTINUED

APPENDIX TABLE B.2
AVERAGE MONTHLY PROGRAM ACTIVITY
(Q.1.09)--CONTINUED

STATE	Referred to Assessment	Job Ready	Not Job Ready	Exempt	Entered Job Search	Entered Employment	Found Non- Compliant	Disqualified
New Mexico	1121	310	0	0	310	264	354	37
New York	2065	1325	0	0	523	163	325	335
North Carolina	1644	1252	0	0	1145	196	177	105
Oklahoma	2318	1462	230	0	991	357	867	307
Oregon	387	310	0	0	305	156	12	10
South Carolina	931	0	0	0	244	173	430	147
South Dakota	425	164	0	0	121	53	87	11
Tennessee	1391	787	0	0	787	398	621	113
Texas	14198	3273	0	0	3273	931	6055	1097
Vermont	90	82	0	0	82	27	36	5
Virgin Islands	42	35	0	0	35	17	16	0
Virginia	1033	727	210	77	726	208	180	138
Washington	2317	1297	0	0	1297	259	742	301
West Virginia	3115	2206	312	0	1839	207	144	277
Wisconsin	566	354	0	0	426	100	143	200
Average	1826	1004			778	208	515	199

APPENDIX TABLE B.3
AGENCIES PERFORMING SUBCONTRACTED FUNCTIONS

STATE	Job Service Performs Subcontracts	Job Service Money Received	Job Service FTE Staff	JTPA Performs Subcontracts	JTPA Money Received
Alabama	0	.	.	0	.
Alaska	1	106681	3.75	0	.
Arizona	1	575942	17	0	.
Arkansas	1	504015	17	0	.
California	1	1809859	50	0	.
Colorado
Delaware	1	187349	5	0	.
Florida	1	2241173	100	0	.
Georgia	1	1222364	38	0	.
Hawaii	1	186509	5	0	.
Idaho	1	272008	7	0	.
Illinois
Iowa	1	619999	51.5	0	.
Kansas
Kentucky
Maine
Minnesota	1	560619	16	0	.
Mississippi
Missouri	1	864588	30	0	.
Montana	1	215195	7	0	.
Nebraska	1	107794	4	0	.
Nevada	1	239880	6	0	.
New Hampshire	1	164197	6	0	.
New Jersey	1	.	.	0	.
New Mexico	1	378518	17	0	.

*Denotes missing data

1=Yes

0=No

CONTINUED

APPENDIX TABLE B.3
AGENCIES PERFORMING SUBCONTRACTED FUNCTIONS--CONTINUED

STATE	Job Service Performs Subcontracts	Job Service Money Received	Job Service FTE Staff	JTPA Performs Subcontracts	JTPA Money Received
New York	1	59800	.	1	110100
North Carolina	1	1195714	41	0	.
Oklahoma
Oregon
South Carolina	1	581424	20	0	.
South Dakota	1	169650	6	0	.
Tennessee	1	1003621	42	0	.
Texas	1	1781720	52	0	.
Vermont	1	42000	2	0	.
Virginia
Washington	1	1269041	32	0	.
West Virginia
Wisconsin	1	581942	29	0	.
Guam	1	20304	2	0	.
Virgin Islands	1	45283	15	0	.

*Denotes missing data

1=Yes

0=No

CONTINUED

APPENDIX TABLE B.3
AGENCIES PERFORMING SUBCONTRACTED FUNCTIONS--CONTINUED

STATE	JTPA FTE Staff	Other Performs		Other FTE Staff
		Subcontracts	Other Money Received	
Alabama	.	1	937669	31
Alaska	.	0	.	.
Arizona	.	0	.	.
Arkansas	.	0	.	.
California	.	0	.	.
Colorado
Delaware	.	0	.	.
Florida	.	0	.	.
Georgia	.	0	.	.
Hawaii	.	1	69819	2
Idaho	.	0	.	.
Illinois
Iowa	.	0	.	.
Kansas
Kentucky
Maine
Minnesota	.	0	.	.
Mississippi
Missouri	.	0	.	.
Montana	.	0	.	.
Nebraska	.	0	.	.
Nevada	.	0	.	.
New Hampshire	.	0	.	.
New Jersey	.	1	.	.
New Mexico	.	0	.	.

*Denotes missing data

1=Yes

0=No

CONTINUED

APPENDIX TABLE B.3
AGENCIES PERFORMING SUBCONTRACTED FUNCTIONS--CONTINUED

STATE	JTPA FTE Staff	Other Performs Subcontracts	Other Money Received	Other FTE Staff
New York	.	1	19300	.
North Carolina	.	0	.	.
Oklahoma
Oregon
South Carolina	.	0	.	.
South Dakota	.	0	.	.
Tennessee	.	0	.	.
Texas	.	0	.	.
Vermont	.	0	.	.
Virginia
Washington	.	0	.	.
West Virginia
Wisconsin	.	0	.	.
Guam	.	0	.	.
Virgin Islands	.	0	.	.

. Denotes missing data

1=Yes

0=No

APPENDIX TABLE B.4
JOB SEARCH CONTRACTS' SUBJECTS AND COVERAGE

STATE	NPA Cases (1,04)	Both PA and NPA (1,04)	Other (1,04)
Alabama	1	0	0
Alaska	1	0	0
Arizona	0	1	0
Arkansas	0	1	0
California	1	0	0
Colorado	0	1	0
Delaware	0	1	0
Florida	1	0	0
Georgia	0	1	0
Hawaii	0	1	0
Idaho	0	1	0
Illinois	0	1	0
Iowa	0	0	1
Kansas	0	1	0
Kentucky	0	1	0
Maine	0	1	0
Minnesota	0	1	0
Mississippi	0	1	0
Missouri	0	1	0
Montana	0	1	0
Nebraska	0	1	0
Nevada	0	1	0
New Hampshire	0	1	0
New Jersey	1	0	0
New Mexico	0	1	0
1=Yes			
0=No			

CONTINUED

APPENDIX TABLE B.4
JOB SEARCH CONTRACTS: SUBJECTS AND COVERAGE--CONTINUED

STATE	NPA Cases (1,04)	Both PA and NPA (1,04)	Other (1,04)
New York	0	1	0
North Carolina	0	1	0
Oklahoma	1	0	0
Oregon	0	0	1
South Carolina	1	0	0
South Dakota	0	1	0
Tennessee	0	1	0
Texas	1	0	0
Vermont	1	0	0
Virginia	1	0	0
Washington	1	0	0
West Virginia	0	1	0
Wisconsin	1	0	0
Guam	1	0	0
Virgin Islands	1	0	0

1=Yes

0=No

APPENDIX TABLE B.5
MOST IMPORTANT CRITERIA USED TO SELECT AREAS FOR PARTICIPATION
IN THE JOB SEARCH PROGRAM
(Q1,06)

STATE	Large FS Caseload	Good Job Markets	High Concentration of HH with High FS	High Concentration of HH with Cert Period Exceeding 2 Months	High Concentration of Job Ready Cases
Alabama	0	1	0	0	0
Alaska	1	1	0	0	0
Arizona	1	1	0	0	1
Arkansas	1	1	0	0	0
California
Colorado	0	0	0	0	0
Delaware
Florida	1	1	0	0	0
Georgia	1	1	0	0	0
Hawaii	0	1	0	0	0
Idaho	1	1	0	0	0
Illinois	1	0	0	0	0
Iowa
Kansas	0	0	0	0	0
Kentucky	0	1	0	0	0
Maine	1	1	0	0	0
Minnesota	1	1	0	0	0
Mississippi	1	1	0	0	0
Missouri
Montana	1	1	0	0	0

*Denotes missing data

1=Yes

0=No

CONTINUED

APPENDIX TABLE B.5
MOST IMPORTANT CRITERIA USED TO SELECT AREAS FOR PARTICIPATION
IN THE JOB SEARCH PROGRAM--CONTINUED
(Q1,06)

STATE	Large FS Caseload	Good Job Markets	High Concentration of HH with High FS	High Concentration of HH with Cert Period Exceeding 2 Months	High Concentration of Job Ready Cases
Nebraska	0	0	0	0	0
Nevada	1	1	0	0	0
New Hampshire	1	1	0	0	0
New Jersey
New Mexico
New York	0	0	0	0	0
North Carolina	0	1	0	0	0
Oklahoma	0	1	0	0	1
Oregon	0	0	0	1	1
South Carolina	0	1	0	0	1
South Dakota	1	1	0	0	0
Tennessee	1	1	1	0	0
Texas	0	0	0	0	0
Vermont	1	1	0	0	0
Virginia	1	1	0	0	0
Washington
West Virginia
Wisconsin	1	0	1	0	0
Guam
Virgin Islands

*Denotes missing data

1=Yes

0=No

CONTINUED

APPENDIX TABLE B.5
 MOST IMPORTANT CRITERIA USED TO SELECT AREAS FOR PARTICIPATION
 IN THE JOB SEARCH PROGRAM--CONTINUED
 (Q1.06)

STATE	Absence of FS Workfare or Other FS Job Search Demo	Coordination with Other Program or Demo	County/Local Preference	Other
Alabama	0	0	0	1
Alaska	0	1	0	0
Arizona	0	0	0	0
Arkansas	1	0	0	1
California				
Colorado	1	1	1	0
Delaware				
Florida	0	0	0	0
Georgia	0	0	1	0
Hawaii	0	0	0	0
Idaho	0	0	0	0
Illinois	1	1	0	0
Iowa
Kansas	0	1	1	1
Kentucky	0	0	0	0
Maine	0	0	0	0
Minnesota	0	0	0	0
Mississippi	0	1	0	1
Missouri
Montana	0	0	1	1
Nebraska	0	0	0	1
Nevada	0	0	0	1
New Hampshire	1	0	0	0
New Jersey
New Mexico

*Denotes missing data

1=Yes

0=No

APPENDIX TABLE B.5
MOST IMPORTANT CRITERIA USED TO SELECT AREAS FOR PARTICIPATION
IN THE JOB SEARCH PROGRAM--CONTINUED
(Q1.06)

	Absence of FS Workfare or Other FS Job Search Demo	Coordination with Other Program or Demo	County/Local Preference	Other
New York	0	0	1	0
North Carolina	0	0	0	1
Oklahoma	0	0	0	1
Oregon	1	1	0	0
South Carolina	0	0	0	0
South Dakota	0	0	0	0
Tennessee	0	0	0	1
Texas	0	0	0	1
Vermont	0	0	0	0
Virginia	1	0	1	0
Washington
West Virginia
Wisconsin	0	0	0	0
Guam
Virgin Islands

*Denotes missing data

1=Yes

0=No

APPENDIX TABLE B.6
STAFF PERFORMING REFERRAL AND ASSESSMENT FOR JOB SEARCH
Q.2.01

STATE	Referral for Assessment				Assessment and Assignment			
	IM Unit	WR/JS Unit	Job Service	Other	IM Unit	WR/JS Unit	Job Service	Other
Alabama	1						1	
Alaska	1							1
Arizona	1						1	
Arkansas	1						1	
California				1			1	
Colorado	1					1		
Delaware	1						1	
Florida	1						1	
Georgia	1						1	
Hawaii	1						1	
Idaho	1						1	
Illinois	1					1		
Iowa				1			1	
Kansas	1					1		
Kentucky	1				1			
Maine	1					1		
Minnesota	1						1	
Mississippi	1					1		
Missouri	1						1	
Montana	1						1	
Nebraska	1						1	
Nevada	1						1	
New Hampshire	1						1	
New Jersey	1						1	
New Mexico	1						1	

1=YES

CONTINUED

APPENDIX TABLE B.6
STAFF PERFORMING REFERRAL AND ASSESSMENT FOR JOB SEARCH--CONTINUED
Q.2.01

STATE	Referral for Assessment				Assessment and Assignment			
	IM Unit	WR/JS Unit	Job Service	Other	IM Unit	WR/JS Unit	Job Service	Other
New York				1				1
North Carolina	1						1	
Oklahoma	1							
Oregon		1				1		
South Carolina	1				1			
South Dakota	1						1	
Tennessee	1						1	
Texas	1						1	
Vermont	1						1	
Virginia	1					1		
Washington	1						1	
West Virginia	1					1		
Wisconsin	1						1	
Guam		1					1	
Virgin Islands	1				1			

1=Yes

CONTINUED

APPENDIX TABLE B.6
STAFF PERFORMING REFERRAL AND ASSESSMENT FOR JOB SEARCH--CONTINUED
Q.2.01

STATE	Job Search Monitoring				Notification of Failure to Comply			
	IM Unit	WR/JS Unit	Job Service	Other	IM Unit	WR/JS Unit	Job Service	Other
Alabama			1				1	
Alaska				1				1
Arizona			1				1	
Arkansas			1				1	
California			1				1	
Colorado		1				1		
Connecticut								
Delaware			1				1	
Dist. of Columbia								
Florida			1				1	
Georgia			1				1	
Hawaii			1				1	
Idaho			1		1			
Illinois		1				1		
Indiana								
Iowa			1				1	
Kansas		1				1		
Kentucky		1				1		
Louisiana								
Maine		1				1		
Maryland								
Massachusetts								
Michigan								
Minnesota			1		1			
Mississippi				1		1		
Missouri			1				1	
Montana			1				1	
Nebraska			1				1	
Nevada			1				1	
New Hampshire		1					1	

1=Yes

CONTINUED

APPENDIX TABLE B.6
STAFF PERFORMING REFERRAL AND ASSESSMENT FOR JOB SEARCH--CONTINUED
Q.2.01

STATE	Job Search Monitoring				Notification of Failure to Comply			
	IM Unit	WR/JS Unit	Job Service	Other	IM Unit	WR/JS Unit	Job Service	Other
New Jersey			1		1			
New Mexico			1				1	
New York				1	1			
North Carolina				1			1	
North Dakota								
Ohio								
Oklahoma		1				1		
Oregon		1			1			
Pennsylvania								
Rhode Island								
South Carolina	1						1	
South Dakota			1				1	
Tennessee			1				1	
Texas			1				1	
Utah								
Vermont			1				1	
Virginia		1				1		
Washington			1				1	
West Virginia		1				1		
Wisconsin			1				1	
Wyoming								
Guam			1		1			
Virgin Islands			1				1	

B-17

CONTINUED

APPENDIX TABLE B.6
STAFF PERFORMING REFERRAL AND ASSESSMENT FOR JOB SEARCH--CONTINUED
Q.2.01

STATE	Disqualification or Denial for Failure to Comply			
	IM Unit	WR/JS Unit	Job Service	Other
Alabama	1			
Alaska	1			
Arizona	1			
Arkansas	1			
California				1
Colorado	1			
Connecticut				
Delaware	1			
Dist. of Columbia				
Florida	1			
Georgia	1			
Hawaii	1			
Idaho	1			
Illinois	1			
Indiana				
Iowa	1			
Kansas	1			
Kentucky	1			
Louisiana				
Maine	1			
Maryland				
Massachusetts				
Michigan				
Minnesota	1			
Mississippi	1			
Missouri	1			
Montana	1			
Nebraska	1			
Nevada	1			
New Hampshire	1			

1=Yes

APPENDIX TABLE B.6
STAFF PERFORMING REFERRAL AND ASSESSMENT FOR JOB SEARCH--CONTINUED
Q.2.01

STATE	Disqualification or Denial for Failure to Comply			
	IM Unit	WR/JS Unit	Job Service	Other
New Jersey	1			
New Mexico	1			
New York	1			
North Carolina	1			
North Dakota				
Ohio				
Oklahoma	1			
Oregon	1			
Pennsylvania				
Rhode Island				
South Carolina	1			
South Dakota	1			
Tennessee	1			
Texas	1			
Utah				
Vermont	1			
Virginia	1			
Washington	1			
West Virginia	1			
Wisconsin	1			
Wyoming				
Guam	1			
Virgin Islands	1			

1=Yes

APPENDIX TABLE B.7
ASSESSMENT CONDUCT AND MINUTES TO PERFORM

STATE	How Are Assessments Conducted		Minutes
	Individually	In Groups	
Alabama	1		15
Alaska	1	1	20
Arizona	1		30
Arkansas	1	1	20
California		1	30
Colorado	1	1	15
Delaware		1	30
Florida	1		20
Georgia	1		60
Hawaii	1		10
Idaho	1		30
Illinois		1	90
Iowa	1		15
Kansas	1	1	37
Kentucky	1		15
Maine	1	1	45
Minnesota	1		20
Mississippi	1	1	45
Missouri	1	1	15
Montana	1		37
Nebraska	1		37
Nevada		1	60
New Hampshire	1		35
New Jersey	1		45
New Mexico	1		20

1=Yes

CONTINUED

APPENDIX TABLE B.7
ASSESSMENT CONDUCT AND MINUTES TO PERFORM--CONTINUED

STATE	How Are Assessments Conducted		Minutes
	Individually	In Groups	
New York	1		30
North Carolina	1		30
Oklahoma	1	1	30
Oregon	1		60
South Carolina	1		20
South Dakota	1		30
Tennessee	1		30
Texas	1		30
Vermont	1		30
Virginia	1	1	182
Washington	1		41
West Virginia	1	1	37
Wisconsin		1	150
Guam	1		30
Virgin Islands	1		10

1=Yes

APPENDIX TABLE B.8
COUNSELING AND TRAINING SERVICES

	Provided		How is Counseling or Training Provided 2,03,02		
	NO	YES	Individually	In Groups	Job Clubs
Alabama	1	0	0	0	0
Alaska	0	1	1	1	0
Arizona	0	1	1	1	0
Arkansas	1	0	0	0	0
California	1	0	0	0	0
Colorado	0	1	1	1	1
Delaware	0	1	1	0	0
Florida	1	0	0	0	0
Georgia	0	1	1	0	0
Hawaii	0	1	0	1	0
Idaho	0	1	0	0	1
Illinois	0	1	1	1	1
Iowa	0	1	1	1	0
Kansas	0	1	1	0	1
Kentucky	1	0	0	0	0
Maine	0	1	1	1	1
Minnesota	0	1	0	1	0
Mississippi	0	1	1	1	1
Missouri	0	1	1	1	0
Montana	0	1	1	0	1
Nebraska	0	1	1	0	0
Nevada	0	1	1	0	0
New Hampshire	0	1	1	0	0
New Jersey	0	1	1	1	0
New Mexico	0	1	1	0	0

CONTINUED

APPENDIX TABLE B.8
COUNSELING AND TRAINING SERVICES--CONTINUED

	Provided		How Is Counseling or Training Provided 2.03.02		
	NO	YES	Individually	In Groups	Job Clubs
New York	0	1	1	1	0
North Carolina	0	1	1	1	1
Oklahoma	0	1	1	1	0
Oregon	0	1	1	1	1
South Carolina	1	0	0	0	0
South Dakota	0	1	1	1	1
Tennessee	1	0	0	0	0
Texas	1	0	0	0	0
Vermont	0	1	1	0	0
Virginia	0	1	1	1	1
Washington	0	1	0	1	0
West Virginia	0	1	1	1	0
Wisconsin	0	1	1	1	0
Guam	0	1	1	0	0
Virgin Islands	0	1	1	1	1

APPENDIX TABLE B.9
COUNSELING AND TRAINING PROCEDURES

STATE	Days (Q2.03.03)	Hours (Q.2.03.03)	Voluntary (Q.2.03.04)	Mandatory (Q.2.03.04)	Participants (Q2.03.05)
Alabama	.	.			.
Alaska	1	2	1 ^a		.
Arizona	2	6	1		.
Arkansas	.	.			.
California	.	.			.
Colorado	.	.	1		1212
Delaware	.	.	1		.
Florida	.	.			.
Georgia	1	1	1		.
Hawaii	5	8	1		41
Idaho	4	4	1		.
Illinois	4	1		1 ^a	.
Iowa	4	4	1		.
Kansas	.	3	1		161
Kentucky	.	.			.
Maine	21	6	1		27
Minnesota	1	3	1		.
Mississippi	4	4	1		2564
Missouri	5	6		1	4058
Montana	.	.		1	800
Nebraska	.	.	1		.
Nevada	.	1	1		.
New Hampshire	.	.	1		.
New Jersey	.	.	1		.
New Mexico	20	5	1		5607

*Denotes missing data

^aIn these columns, 1=Yes.

CONTINUED

APPENDIX TABLE B.9
COUNSELING AND TRAINING PROCEDURES--CONTINUED

STATE	Days (Q2.03.03)	Hours (Q.2.03.03)	Voluntary (Q.2.03.04)	Mandatory (Q.2.03.04)	Participants (Q2.03.05)
New York	1	1		1	6627
North Carolina	.	.		1	.
Oklahoma	1	4	1		1409
Oregon	5	3		1	.
South Carolina	.	.			.
South Dakota	2	4	1		.
Tennessee	.	.			.
Texas	.	.			.
Vermont	1	2	1		411
Virginia	.	.		1	3630
Washington	1	3	1		.
West Virginia	1	3		1	26818
Wisconsin	3	1	1		.
Guam	4	8	1		.
Virgin Islands	.	.		1	.
TOTAL			23	8	

APPENDIX TABLE B.10
COMPONENTS OF WORK REGISTRATION/JOB SEARCH PROGRAM (Q2.04.01)

STATE	Referral	Participants	Job Development	Participants	FS Workfare
Alabama	1	.	1	.	2
Alaska	1	.	1	.	2
Arizona	1	2099	1	.	2
Arkansas	1	.	2	.	2
California	1	.	2	.	1
Colorado	1	.	1	.	2
Delaware	1	.	1	.	2
Florida	1	.	1	.	1
Georgia	1	2387	1	3894	2
Hawaii	1	.	2	.	2
Idaho	1	.	2	.	2
Illinois	1	.	.	.	1
Iowa	1	.	1	.	2
Kansas	1	.	2	.	2
Kentucky	1	1619	2	.	2
Maine	1	.	2	.	2
Minnesota	1	460	1	75	2
Mississippi	1	.	1	.	2
Missouri	1	2833	1	.	2
Montana	1	2010	1	.	2
Nebraska	1	1137	2	.	2
Nevada	1	.	1	.	2
New Hampshire	1	.	1	.	2
New Jersey	2	.	2	.	2
New Mexico	1	.	1	.	2

*Denotes missing data

1=Yes

2=No

CONTINUED

APPENDIX TABLE B.10
COMPONENTS OF WORK REGISTRATION/JOB SEARCH PROGRAM (Q2,04,01)--CONTINUED

	Referral	Participants	Job Development	Participants	FS Workfare
New York	1	.	1	.	2
North Carolina	1	.	2	.	1
Oklahoma	1	4957	2	.	2
Oregon	1	.	1	.	2
South Carolina	1	4980	2	.	2
South Dakota	1	.	1	.	2
Tennessee	1	.	2	.	2
Texas	1	7012	1	.	2
Vermont	1	.	1	.	2
Virginia	1	.	1	.	2
Washington	1	.	2	.	1
West Virginia	2	.	2	.	2
Wisconsin	1	180	2	.	1
Guam	1	.	1	.	2
Virgin Islands	1	.	1	.	2

*Denotes missing data

1=Yes

2=No

CONTINUED

APPENDIX TABLE B.10
COMPONENTS OF WORK REGISTRATION/JOB SEARCH PROGRAM (Q2.04.01)--CONTINUED

STATE	Participants	Classroom Training	Participants	On-the-job Training	Participants
Alabama	.	2	.	2	0
Alaska	.	1	.	2	0
Arizona	.	2	.	2	0
Arkansas	.	2	.	2	0
California	.	2	.	2	0
Colorado	.	2	.	2	0
Delaware	.	2	.	2	0
Florida	05	2	.	2	0
Georgia	.	2	.	2	0
Hawaii	.	2	.	2	0
Idaho	.	2	.	2	0
Illinois	.	1	.	2	0
Iowa	.	1	.	2	0
Kansas	.	2	.	2	0
Kentucky	.	2	.	2	0
Maine	.	1	.	2	0
Minnesota	.	1	.	2	0
Mississippi	.	2	.	2	0
Missouri	.	2	.	2	0
Montana	.	2	.	1	1
Nebraska	.	2	.	2	0
Nevada	.	2	.	2	0
New Hampshire	.	1	.	1	0
New Jersey	.	1	.	2	0
New Mexico	.	1	.	1	0

*Denotes data missing

1=Yes

2=No

CONTINUED

APPENDIX TABLE B.10
COMPONENTS OF WORK REGISTRATION/JOB SEARCH PROGRAM (Q2,04,01)--CONTINUED

STATE	Participants	Classroom Training	Participants	On-the-job Training	Participants
New York	.	1	.	1	0
North Carolina	.	1	.	1	0
Oklahoma	.	1	1409	2	0
Oregon	.	1	.	1	0
South Carolina	.	2	.	2	0
South Dakota	.	2	.	2	0
Tennessee	.	2	.	2	0
Texas	.	2	.	2	0
Vermont	.	1	.	1	0
Virginia	.	2	.	2	0
Washington	.	2	.	2	0
West Virginia	.	2	.	2	0
Wisconsin	1294	1	60	1	180
Guam	.	2	.	1	0
Virgin Islands	.	.	.	1	0

*Denotes data missing

1=Yes

2=No

CONTINUED

APPENDIX TABLE B.10
COMPONENTS OF WORK REGISTRATION/JOB SEARCH PROGRAM (Q2.04.01)--CONTINUED

STATE	Other	Participants
Alabama	2	.
Alaska	2	.
Arizona	1	.
Arkansas	2	.
California	2	.
Colorado	2	.
Delaware	2	.
Florida	2	.
Georgia	2	.
Hawaii	2	.
Idaho	2	.
Illinois	2	.
Iowa	2	.
Kansas	1	161
Kentucky	2	.
Maine	2	.
Minnesota	1	.
Mississippi	2	.
Missouri	2	.
Montana	1	750
Nebraska	2	.
Nevada	2	.
New Hampshire	1	.
New Jersey	2	.
New Mexico	1	.

*Denotes data missing

1=Yes

2=No

CONTINUED

APPENDIX TABLE B.10
COMPONENTS OF WORK REGISTRATION/JOB SEARCH PROGRAM (Q2.04.01)--CONTINUED

STATE	Other	Participants
New York	2	.
North Carolina	2	.
Oklahoma	2	.
Oregon	1	.
South Carolina	2	.
South Dakota	2	.
Tennessee	2	.
Texas	2	.
Vermont	1	.
Virginia	2	.
Washington	2	.
West Virginia	2	.
Wisconsin	2	.
Guam	1	.
Virgin Islands	2	.

*Denotes data missing

1=Yes

2=No

CONTINUED

APPENDIX TABLE B.11
JOB SEARCH CONTACTS AND DURATION (Q205.01, Q205.02, Q205.03)

STATE	Number of Contacts	Weeks in Period	Continuous	Separate	Varies
Alabama	24	8	1	0	0
Alaska	24	8	1	0	0
Arizona	24	8	0	0	1
Arkansas	24	8	1	0	0
California	24	8	1	0	0
Colorado	24	8	1	0	0
Delaware	24	8	1	0	0
Florida	24	8	1	0	0
Georgia	24	52	0	1	0
Hawaii	18	8	0	0	1
Idaho	24	8	0	0	1
Illinois	24	8	1	0	0
Iowa	24	8	0	0	1
Kansas	24	8	1	0	0
Kentucky	24	8	1	0	0
Maine	24	8	0	0	1
Minnesota	24	8	0	0	1
Mississippi	24	8	0	0	1
Missouri	18	6	0	0	1
Montana	24	8	1	0	0
Nebraska	24	8	0	0	1
Nevada	24	8	1	0	0
New Hampshire	24	4	0	0	1
New Jersey	24	8	1	0	0
New Mexico	24	4	1	0	0

*Denotes data missing

1=Yes

0=No

CONTINUED

APPENDIX TABLE B.11
 JOB SEARCH CONTACTS AND DURATION (Q205.01, Q205.02, Q205.03)--CONTINUED

STATE	Number of Contacts	Weeks in Period	Continuous	Separate	Varies
New York	24	8	1	0	0
North Carolina	24	8	1	0	0
Oklahoma	15	8	0	0	1
Oregon	24	8	1	0	0
South Carolina	24	8	1	0	0
South Dakota	24	8	0	0	1
Tennessee	8	8	0	0	1
Texas	24	8	1	0	0
Vermont	24	8	0	0	1
Virginia	24	8	0	0	1
Washington	24	8	1	0	0
West Virginia	24	52	0	1	0
Wisconsin	24	8	1	0	0
Guam	24	8	0	0	1
Virgin Islands	16	8	0	1	0
1=Yes					
0=No					

APPENDIX TABLE B.12
JOB SEARCH PROCEDURES (Q206.01, Q206.02, Q206.03)

STATE	How Often are Registrants Required to Report			What Items are Registrants Required to Report	
	Every 4 weeks	Every 8 weeks	Varies	Name of Employers Contacted	Name of Contact Person
Alabama	1	0	0	1	0
Alaska	1	0	0	1	1
Arizona	1	0	0	1	1
Arkansas	1	0	0	1	1
California	1	0	0	1	1
Colorado	1	0	0	1	1
Delaware	1	0	0	0	0
Florida	0	0	1	1	1
Georgia	1	0	0	1	1
Hawaii	1	0	0	1	1
Idaho	1	0	0	1	1
Illinois	1	0	0	1	0
Iowa	1	0	0	1	1
Kansas	1	0	0	1	1
Kentucky	1	0	0	1	1
Maine	1	0	0	1	1
Minnesota	1	0	0	1	0
Mississippi	1	0	0	1	1
Missouri	0	0	1	1	1
Montana	0	0	1	1	1

1=yes

2=no

CONTINUED

APPENDIX TABLE B.12
JOB SEARCH PROCEDURES (Q206.01, Q206.02, Q206.03)--CONTINUED

	How Often are Registrants Required to Report			What Items are Registrants Required to Report	
	Every 4 weeks	Every 8 weeks	Varies	Name of Employers Contacted	Name of Contact Person
Nebraska	0	0	1	1	1
Nevada	0	0	1	1	1
New Hampshire	1	0	0	1	1
New Jersey	0	0	1	1	1
New Mexico	1	0	0	1	1
New York	1	0	0	1	1
North Carolina	0	1	0	1	0
Oklahoma	1	0	0	1	0
Oregon	0	0	1	1	1
South Carolina	1	0	0	1	1
South Dakota	0	0	1	1	1
Tennessee	1	0	0	1	1
Texas	1	0	0	1	1
Vermont	1	0	0	1	1
Virginia	0	1	0	1	1
Washington	1	0	0	1	0
West Virginia	1	0	0	1	1
Wisconsin	1	0	0	1	1
Guam	1	0	0	1	1
Virgin Islands	1	0	0	1	1

1=Yes

0=No

CONTINUED

APPENDIX TABLE B.12
JOB SEARCH PROCEDURES (Q206.01, Q206.02, Q206.03)--CONTINUED

STATE	What Items are Registrants Required to Report			Does Agency Confirm All Cases	
	Date of Contact	Result of Contact	Other	Confirm All	Some
Alabama	1	1	0	0	1
Alaska	1	0	1	0	0
Arizona	1	1	1	1	0
Arkansas	1	1	0	0	0
California	1	1	0	0	1
Colorado	1	1	1	0	1
Delaware	0	0	0	0	0
Florida	1	1	0	0	0
Georgia	1	1	0	1	0
Hawaii	1	1	1	0	0
Idaho	1	1	1	0	1
Illinois	1	1	0	0	1
Iowa	1	1	1	0	1
Kansas	1	1	0	1	0
Kentucky	1	1	1	0	0
Maine	1	1	1	0	1
Minnesota	1	1	0	0	0
Mississippi	1	1	1	0	1
Missouri	1	1	1	0	0
Montana	1	0	1	0	1
1=Yes					
0=No					

CONTINUED

APPENDIX TABLE B.12
JOB SEARCH PROCEDURES (Q206.01, Q206.02, Q206.03)--CONTINUED

STATE	What Items are Registrants Required to Report			Does Agency Confirm All Cases	
	Date of Contact	Result of Contact	Other	Confirm All	Some
Nebraska	1	1	0	0	1
Nevada	0	1	1	0	1
New Hampshire	1	1	1	0	1
New Jersey	1	1	0	0	1
New Mexico	1	1	0	0	0
New York	1	1	1	0	0
North Carolina	1	1	0	0	0
Oklahoma	0	0	0	1	0
Oregon	1	1	1	0	1
South Carolina	1	1	0	0	0
South Dakota	1	1	0	0	0
Tennessee	1	1	1	0	0
Texas	1	1	0	0	1
Vermont	1	1	1	0	1
Virginia	1	1	0	0	1
Washington	1	1	0	0	0
West Virginia	1	1	1	0	1
Wisconsin	1	1	1	0	1
Guam	1	1	0	0	1
Virgin Islands	1	1	1	0	1

1=Yes

0=No

CONTINUED

APPENDIX TABLE B.12
 JOB SEARCH PROCEDURES (Q206.01, Q206.02, Q206.03)--CONTINUED

STATE	Does Agency Confirm All Cases
	Minimum Requirement of One
Alabama	0
Alaska	1
Arizona	0
Arkansas	0
California	0
Colorado	0
Delaware	0
Florida	1
Georgia	0
Hawaii	1
Idaho	0
Illinois	0
Iowa	0
Kansas	0
Kentucky	1
Maine	0
Minnesota	1
Mississippi	0
Missouri	1
Montana	0

1=Yes

0=No

CONTINUED

APPENDIX TABLE B.12
 JOB SEARCH PROCEDURES (Q206.01, Q206.02, Q206.03)--CONTINUED

STATE	Does Agency Confirm All Cases
	----- Minimum Requirement of One
Nebraska	0
Nevada	0
New Hampshire	0
New Jersey	0
New Mexico	1
New York	1
North Carolina	0
Oklahoma	0
Oregon	0
South Carolina	1
South Dakota	1
Tennessee	1
Texas	0
Vermont	0
Virginia	0
Washington	0
West Virginia	0
Wisconsin	0
Guam	0
Virgin Islands	0
1=Yes	
0=No	

APPENDIX TABLE B.13

LEVEL AT WHICH RECORDS ARE TABULATED (Q3.01.01)

STATE	Referred		Assessed		Entered Job Search		Placed/Employed	
	Local	State	Local	State	Local	State	Local	State
Alabama		1		1		1		1
Alaska	1		1		1		1	
Arizona	1		1		1		1	
Arkansas	1		1		1		1	
California	1		1		1		1	
Colorado	1		1		1		1	
Delaware	1		1		1		1	
Florida	1			1		1	1	1
Georgia	1		1		1		1	
Hawaii	1		1		1		1	
Idaho	1		1		1		1	
Illinois	1		1		1		1	
Iowa		1	1		1		1	
Kansas	1		1		1		1	
Kentucky	1		1		1		1	
Maine	1		1		1		1	
Minnesota	1		1		1		1	
Mississippi	1		1		1		1	
Missouri		1	1		1		1	
Montana	1		1		1		1	

1=Yes

CONTINUED

APPENDIX TABLE B.13

LEVEL AT WHICH RECORDS ARE TABULATED (Q3.01.01)--CONTINUED

STATE	Referred		Assessed		Entered Job Search		Placed/Employed	
	Local	State	Local	State	Local	State	Local	State
Nebraska	1		1		1		1	
Nevada		1		1		1		1
New Hampshire	1		1		1		1	
New Jersey	1		1		1		1	
New Mexico	1		1		1		1	
New York	1		1		1		1	
North Carolina	1		1		1		1	
Oklahoma	1		1		1		1	
Oregon	1		1		1		1	
South Carolina	1		1		1		1	
South Dakota	1		1		1		1	
Tennessee	1		1		1		1	
Texas		1	1		1		1	
Vermont	1		1		1		1	
Virginia	1		1		1		1	
Washington	1		1		1		1	
West Virginia	1		1		1		1	
Wisconsin	1		1		1		1	
Guam		1		1		1	1	
Virgin Islands	1		1		1		1	

1=Yes

CONTINUED

APPENDIX TABLE B.13

LEVEL AT WHICH RECORDS ARE TABULATED (Q3.01.01)--CONTINUED

STATE	Noncompliant		Disqualified	
	Local	State	Local	State
Alabama		1		1
Alaska	1			1
Arizona	1		1	
Arkansas	1		1	
California	1		1	
Colorado	1		1	
Delaware	1			1
Florida		1		1
Georgia	1			1
Hawaii	1		1	
Idaho	1		1	
Illinois	1		1	
Iowa	1			1
Kansas	1		1	
Kentucky	1		1	
Maine	1		1	
Minnesota	1		1	
Mississippi	1		1	
Missouri	1		1	
Montana	1		1	

1=Yes

CONTINUED

APPENDIX TABLE B.13

LEVEL AT WHICH RECORDS ARE TABULATED (Q3.01.01)--CONTINUED

STATE	Noncompliant		Disqualified	
	Local	State	Local	State
Nebraska	1		1	
Nevada		1		1
New Hampshire	1		1	
New Jersey	1		1	
New Mexico			1	
New York	1		1	
North Carolina	1		1	
Oklahoma	1			1
Oregon	1		1	
South Carolina	1		1	
South Dakota	1		1	
Tennessee	1		1	
Texas	1			1
Vermont	1		1	
Virginia	1		1	
Washington	1		1	
West Virginia	1		1	
Wisconsin	1		1	
Guam		1		1
Virgin Islands	1		1	

1=Yes

APPENDIX TABLE B.14

METHOD OF TABULATION (Q.3.01.02)

STATE	Referred		Assessed		Entered Job Search		Placed/Employed	
	Computer	Hand	Computer	Hand	Computer	Hand	Computer	Hand
Alabama	1		1		1		1	
Alaska		1		1		1		1
Arizona		1		1		1		1
Arkansas		1		1		1		1
California	1		1		1		1	
Colorado		1		1		1		1
Delaware		1		1		1		1
Florida		1	1		1			1
Georgia		1		1		1		1
Hawaii		1		1		1		1
Idaho		1		1		1		1
Illinois		1		1		1		1
Iowa	1			1		1		1
Kansas		1		1		1		1
Kentucky		1		1		1		1
Maine		1		1		1		1
Minnesota		1		1		1		1
Mississippi		1		1		1		1
Missouri	1		1		1		1	
Montana	1		1		1		1	

1=Yes

CONTINUED

APPENDIX TABLE B.14

METHOD OF TABULATION (Q.3.01.02)--CONTINUED

STATE	Referred		Assessed		Entered Job Search		Placed/Employed	
	Computer	Hand	Computer	Hand	Computer	Hand	Computer	Hand
Nebraska		1		1		1		1
Nevada	1		1		1		1	
New Hampshire		1		1		1		1
New Jersey		1		1		1		1
New Mexico	1		1		1		1	
New York		1		1		1		1
North Carolina		1		1		1		1
Oklahoma		1		1		1		1
Oregon		1		1		1		1
South Carolina		1		1		1		1
South Dakota	1		1		1		1	
Tennessee		1		1		1		1
Texas	1			1		1		1
Vermont		1		1		1		1
Virginia		1		1		1		1
Washington	1		1		1		1	
West Virginia	1		1		1		1	
Wisconsin	1		1		1		1	
Guam		1		1		1		1
Virgin Islands		1		1		1		1

1=Yes

CONTINUED

APPENDIX TABLE B.14

METHOD OF TABULATION (Q.3.01.02)--CONTINUED

STATE	Noncompliant		Disqualified	
	Computer	Hand	Computer	Hand
Alabama	1		1	
Alaska		1		1
Arizona		1		1
Arkansas		1		1
California	1		1	
Colorado		1		1
Delaware		1	1	
Florida	1		1	
Georgia		1	1	
Hawaii		1		1
Idaho		1		1
Illinois		1		1
Iowa		1	1	
Kansas		1		1
Kentucky		1		1
Maine		1		1
Minnesota		1		1
Mississippi		1		1
Missouri	1		1	
Montana	1		1	

1=Yes

CONTINUED

APPENDIX TABLE B.14

METHOD OF TABULATION (Q.3.01.02)--CONTINUED

STATE	Noncompliant		Disqualified	
	Computer	Hand	Computer	Hand
Nebraska		1		1
Nevada	1		1	
New Hampshire		1	1	
New Jersey		1		1
New Mexico	1		1	
New York		1		1
North Carolina		1		1
Oklahoma		1	1	
Oregon		1		1
South Carolina		1		1
South Dakota	1		1	
Tennessee		1		1
Texas		1	1	
Vermont		1		1
Virginia		1		1
Washington	1			1
West Virginia	1		1	
Wisconsin	1		1	
Guam		1		1
Virgin Islands		1		1

1=Yes

APPENDIX TABLE B.15

METHOD OF PREPARING FINAL STATE TOTALS (Q.3.01.03)

STATE	Referred			Assessed			Entered Job Search			Placed/ Employed
	Computer	Hand	Summarized	Computer	Hand	Summarized	Computer	Hand	Summarized	Computer
Alabama	1			1			1			1
Alaska		1			1			1		
Arizona			1			1			1	
Arkansas			1			1			1	
California			1			1			1	
Colorado			1			1			1	
Delaware			1			1			1	
Florida			1	1			1			
Georgia			1			1			1	
Hawaii			1			1			1	
Idaho			1			1			1	
Illinois			1			1			1	
Iowa	1					1			1	
Kansas			1			1			1	
Kentucky			1			1			1	
Maine			1			1			1	
Minnesota			1			1			1	
Mississippi			1			1			1	
Missouri	1			1			1			1
Montana			1			1			1	
Nebraska			1			1			1	
Nevada	1			1			1			1
New Hampshire			1			1			1	
New Jersey			1			1			1	
New Mexico	1			1			1			1

1=Yes

CONTINUED

APPENDIX TABLE B.15

METHOD OF PREPARING FINAL STATE TOTALS (Q.3.01.03)--CONTINUED

STATE	Referred			Assessed			Entered Job Search			Placed/ Employed
	Computer	Hand	Summarized	Computer	Hand	Summarized	Computer	Hand	Summarized	Computer
New York			1			1			1	
North Carolina		1			1			1		
Oklahoma			1			1			1	
Oregon			1			1			1	
South Carolina			1			1			1	
South Dakota			1			1			1	
Tennessee			1			1			1	
Texas			1			1			1	
Vermont			1			1			1	
Virginia			1			1			1	
Washington			1			1			1	
West Virginia	1			1			1			1
Wisconsin	1			1			1			1
Guam		1			1			1		
Virgin Islands			1			1			1	

1-Yes

CONTINUED

APPENDIX TABLE B.15

METHOD OF PREPARING FINAL STATE TOTALS (Q.3.01.03)--CONTINUED

STATE	Placed/Employed		Noncompliant			Disqualified		
	Hand	Summarized	Computer	Hand	Summarized	Computer	Hand	Summarized
Alabama			1			1		
Alaska	1			1			1	
Arizona		1			1			1
Arkansas		1			1			1
California		1			1			1
Colorado		1			1			1
Delaware		1			1	1		
Florida		1	1			1		
Georgia		1			1	1		
Hawaii		1			1			1
Idaho		1			1			1
Illinois		1			1			1
Iowa		1			1	1		
Kansas		1			1			1
Kentucky		1			1			1
Maine		1			1			1
Minnesota		1			1			1
Mississippi		1			1			1
Missouri			1			1		
Montana		1			1			1
Nebraska		1			1			1
Nevada			1			1		
New Hampshire		1			1	1		
New Jersey		1			1			1
New Mexico			1			1		

1=Yes

CONTINUED

APPENDIX TABLE B.15

METHOD OF PREPARING FINAL STATE TOTALS (Q.3.01.03)--CONTINUED

STATE	Placed/Employed		Noncompliant			Disqualified		
	Hand	Summarized	Computer	Hand	Summarized	Computer	Hand	Summarized
New York		1			1			1
North Carolina	1			1		1		
Oklahoma		1			1	1		
Oregon		1			1			1
South Carolina		1			1			1
South Dakota		1			1			1
Tennessee		1			1			1
Texas		1			1			1
Vermont		1			1			1
Virginia		1			1			1
Washington		1			1			1
West Virginia			1			1		
Wisconsin			1			1		
Guam	1			1			1	
Virgin Islands		1			1			1

1=Yes

APPENDIX TABLE B.16

METHOD OF PREPARATION OF YEAR-TO-DATE CUMULATIVE TOTALS (Q.3.01.04)

STATE	Referred		Assessed		Entered Job Search		Placed/Employed	
	All	New	All	New	All	New	All	New
	Transactions Added to Previous Total	Participants Added to Previous Total	Transactions Added to Previous Total	Participants Added to Previous Total	Transactions Added to Previous Total	Participants Added to Previous Total	Transactions Added to Previous Total	Participants Added to Previous Total
Alabama	1		1		1		1	
Alaska	1		1		1		1	
Arizona	1		1		1		1	
Arkansas	1		1		1		1	
California	1		1		1		1	
Colorado	1		1		1		1	
Delaware	1		1		1		1	
Florida	1		1		1		1	
Georgia		1		1		1		1
Hawaii	1		1		1		1	
Idaho	1		1		1		1	
Illinois		1		1		1		1
Iowa	1		1		1		1	
Kansas	1		1		1		1	
Kentucky	1		1		1		1	
Maine		1		1		1		1
Minnesota	1		1		1		1	
Mississippi	1		1		1		1	
Missouri	1		1		1		1	
Montana	1		1		1		1	

1=Yes

CONTINUED

APPENDIX TABLE B.16

METHOD OF PREPARATION OF YEAR-TO-DATE CUMULATIVE TOTALS (Q.3.01.04)--CONTINUED

STATE	Referred		Assessed		Entered Job Search		Placed/Employed	
	All	New	All	New	All	New	All	New
	Transactions Added to Previous Total	Participants Added to Previous Total	Transactions Added to Previous Total	Participants Added to Previous Total	Transactions Added to Previous Total	Participants Added to Previous Total	Transactions Added to Previous Total	Participants Added to Previous Total
Nebraska	1		1		1		1	
Nevada	1		1		1		1	
New Hampshire	1		1		1		1	
New Jersey		1		1		1		1
New Mexico	1		1		1		1	
New York	1		1		1		1	
North Carolina	1		1		1		1	
Oklahoma		1		1		1		1
Oregon	1		1		1		1	
South Carolina	1		1		1		1	
South Dakota		1		1		1		1
Tennessee	1		1		1		1	
Texas	1		1		1		1	
Vermont	1		1		1		1	
Virginia	1		1		1		1	
Washington	1		1		1		1	
West Virginia	1		1		1		1	
Wisconsin	1		1		1		1	
Guam	1		1		1		1	
Virgin Islands	1		1		1		1	

1=Yes

CONTINUED

APPENDIX TABLE B.16

METHOD OF PREPARATION OF YEAR-TO-DATE CUMULATIVE TOTALS (Q.3.01.04)--CONTINUED

STATE	Noncompliant		Disqualified	
	All	New	All	New
	Transactions	Participants	Transactions	Participants
	Added to Previous Total	Added to Previous Total	Added to Previous Total	Added to Previous Total
Alabama	1		1	
Alaska	1		1	
Arizona	1		1	
Arkansas	1		1	
California	1		1	
Colorado	1		1	
Delaware	1		1	
Florida	1		1	
Georgia		1		1
Hawaii	1		1	
Idaho	1		1	
Illinois		1		1
Iowa	1		1	
Kansas	1		1	
Kentucky	1		1	
Maine		1		1
Minnesota	1		1	
Mississippi	1		1	
Missouri	1		1	
Montana	1		1	

1=Yes

CONTINUED

APPENDIX TABLE B.16

METHOD OF PREPARATION OF YEAR-TO-DATE CUMULATIVE TOTALS (Q.3.01.04)--CONTINUED

STATE	Noncompliant		Disqualified	
	All	New	All	New
	Transactions	Participants	Transactions	Participants
	Added to Previous Total	Added to Previous Total	Added to Previous Total	Added to Previous Total
Nebraska	1		1	
Nevada	1		1	
New Hampshire	1		1	
New Jersey		1		1
New Mexico	1		1	
New York	1		1	
North Carolina	1		1	
Oklahoma		1		1
Oregon	1		1	
South Carolina	1		1	
South Dakota		1		1
Tennessee	1		1	
Texas	1		1	
Vermont	1		1	
Virginia	1		1	
Washington	1		1	
West Virginia	1		1	
Wisconsin	1		1	
Guam	1		1	
Virgin Islands	1		1	

APPENDIX TABLE B.17

COMPUTERIZED CASE MANAGEMENT OR PARTICIPANT TRACKING ACTIVITIES (Q.3.01.05)

STATE	Referred	Assessed	Entered Job Search	Placed/Employed	Noncompliant
Alabama	1	1	1	1	1
Alaska					
Arizona	1	1	1	1	1
Arkansas					
California					
Colorado	1	1	1	1	1
Delaware					
Florida	1	1	1	1	1
Georgia					
Hawaii					
Idaho	1	1	1	1	
Illinois	1	1	1	1	1
Iowa	1				
Kansas					
Kentucky					
Maine					
Minnesota					
Mississippi					
Missouri	1	1	1	1	1
Montana		1	1	1	1
Nebraska					
Nevada	1	1	1	1	1
New Hampshire					
New Jersey					
New Mexico	1	1	1	1	1

1=Yes

CONTINUED

APPENDIX TABLE B.17

COMPUTERIZED CASE MANAGEMENT OR PARTICIPANT TRACKING ACTIVITIES (Q.3.01.05)--CONTINUED

STATE	Referred	Assessed	Entered Job Search	Placed/Employed	Noncompliant
New York	1	1	1	1	1
North Carolina					
Oklahoma					
Oregon				1	
South Carolina					
South Dakota					
Tennessee					
Texas	1				
Vermont					
Virginia	1	1	1	1	1
Washington	1	1	1	1	1
West Virginia	1	1	1	1	1
Wisconsin	1	1	1	1	1
Guam					
Virgin Islands					

1=Yes

CONTINUED

APPENDIX TABLE B.17

COMPUTERIZED CASE MANAGEMENT OR PARTICIPANT TRACKING ACTIVITIES (Q.3.01.05)--CONTINUED

STATE	Disqualified
Alabama	1
Alaska	
Arizona	
Arkansas	
California	
Colorado	1
Delaware	1
Florida	1
Georgia	1
Hawaii	
Idaho	
Illinois	1
Iowa	1
Kansas	
Kentucky	
Maine	
Minnesota	1
Mississippi	
Missouri	1
Montana	1
Nebraska	
Nevada	1
New Hampshire	1
New Jersey	
New Mexico	1

1=Yes

CONTINUED

APPENDIX TABLE B.17

COMPUTERIZED CASE MANAGEMENT OR PARTICIPANT TRACKING ACTIVITIES (Q.3.01.05)--CONTINUED

STATE	Disqualified
New York	1
North Carolina	1
Oklahoma	1
Oregon	1
South Carolina	
South Dakota	
Tennessee	
Texas	1
Vermont	
Virginia	1
Washington	1
West Virginia	1
Wisconsin	1
Guam	
Virgin Islands	

1=Yes

APPENDIX TABLE B.18

EXTENT TO WHICH ACTIVITIES ARE COMPUTERIZED (Q.3.01.06)

STATE	Referred			Assessed			Entered Job Search	
	Statistical Reporting Only	Batch Listings/Ros ters	Online Entry/Query	Statistical Reporting Only	Batch Listings/Ros ters	Online Entry/Query	Statistical Reporting Only	Batch Listings/Ros ters
Alabama			1			1		
Alaska								
Arizona			1			1		
Arkansas								
California								
Colorado			1			1		
Delaware								
Florida			1			1		
Georgia								
Hawaii								
Idaho						1		
Illinois			1			1		
Iowa	1							
Kansas								
Kentucky								
Maine								
Minnesota								
Mississippi								
Missouri			1			1		
Montana						1		

1=Yes

CONTINUED

APPENDIX TABLE B.18

EXTENT TO WHICH ACTIVITIES ARE COMPUTERIZED (Q.3.01.06)--CONTINUED

	Referred			Assessed			Entered Job Search	
	Statistical Reporting	Batch Listings/Pos	Online Entry/Query	Statistical Reporting	Batch Listings/Pos	Online Entry/Query	Statistical Reporting	Batch Listings/Pos
STATE	Only	ters		Only	ters		Only	ters
Nebraska								
Nevada			1			1		
New Hampshire								
New Jersey								
New Mexico			1		1			1
New York	1			1			1	
North Carolina								
Oklahoma								
Oregon								
South Carolina								
South Dakota								
Tennessee								
Texas	1							
Vermont								
Virginia	1			1			1	
Washington	1			1			1	
West Virginia			1			1		
Wisconsin	1			1				
Guam								
Virgin Islands								

APPENDIX TABLE B.18

EXTENT TO WHICH ACTIVITIES ARE COMPUTERIZED (Q.3.01.06)--CONTINUED

STATE	Entered Job Search		Placed/Employed		Noncompliant		Disqualified	
	Online Entry/Query	Statistical Reporting Only	Batch Listings/Ros ters	Online Entry/Query	Statistical Reporting Only	Batch Listings/Ros ters	Online Entry/Query	Statistical Reporting Only
Alabama	1			1			1	
Alaska								
Arizona	1			1			1	
Arkansas								
California								
Colorado				1			1	
Delaware								1
Florida	1			1			1	
Georgia								
Hawaii								
Idaho	1			1				
Illinois	1			1			1	
Iowa								
Kansas								
Kentucky								
Maine								
Minnesota								
Mississippi								
Missouri	1			1			1	
Montana	1			1			1	

1=Yes

CONTINUED

APPENDIX TABLE B.18

EXTENT TO WHICH ACTIVITIES ARE COMPUTERIZED (Q.3.01.06)--CONTINUED

STATE	Entered Job Search		Placed/Employed		Noncompliant		Disqualified	
	Online Entry/Query	Statistical Reporting Only	Batch Listings/Ros ters	Online Entry/Query	Statistical Reporting Only	Batch Listings/Ros ters	Online Entry/Query	Statistical Reporting Only
Nebraska								
Nevada	1			1			1	
New Hampshire								1
New Jersey								
New Mexico			1			1		
New York		1			1			1
North Carolina								1
Oklahoma								1
Oregon		1						1
South Carolina								
South Dakota								
Tennessee								
Texas								1
Vermont								
Virginia		1			1			1
Washington		1			1			1
West Virginia	1			1			1	
Wisconsin		1			1			1
Guam								
Virgin Islands								

1=Yes

CONTINUED

APPENDIX TABLE B.18

EXTENT TO WHICH ACTIVITIES ARE COMPUTERIZED (Q.3.01.06)--CONTINUED

STATE	Disqualified	
	Batch Listings/Ros ters	Online Entry/Query
Alabama		1
Alaska		
Arizona		
Arkansas		
California		
Colorado		1
Delaware	1	
Florida		1
Georgia	1	
Hawaii		
Idaho		
Illinois		1
Iowa	1	
Kansas		
Kentucky		
Maine		
Minnesota	1	
Mississippi		
Missouri		1
Montana		1

1=Yes

CONTINUED

APPENDIX TABLE B.18

EXTENT TO WHICH ACTIVITIES ARE COMPUTERIZED (Q.3.01.06)---CONTINUED

STATE	Disqualified	
	Batch Listings/Ros ters	Online Entry/Query
Nebraska		
Nevada		1
New Hampshire		
New Jersey		
New Mexico	1	
New York		
North Carolina		
Oklahoma		
Oregon		
South Carolina		
South Dakota		
Tennessee		
Texas		
Vermont		
Virginia		
Washington		
West Virginia		1
Wisconsin		
Guam		
Virgin Islands		

APPENDIX TABLE B.19
WHEN ARE REGISTRANTS COUNTED AS REFERRED (Q3.02.02)

STATE	New Certification	Both New and Recertification	Other
Alabama		1	
Alaska		1	
Arizona		1	
Arkansas		1	
California		1	
Colorado		1	
Delaware		1	
Florida		1	
Georgia		1	
Hawaii		1	
Idaho		1	
Illinois		1	
Iowa		1	
Kansas		1	
Kentucky		1	
Maine		1	
Minnesota		1	
Mississippi		1	
Missouri	1		
Montana		1	
Nebraska	1		
Nevada		1	
New Hampshire		1	
New Jersey		1	
New Mexico		1	
New York	1		
North Carolina		1	
Oklahoma		1	
Oregon	1		
South Carolina		1	
South Dakota	1		
Tennessee		1	
Texas	1		
Vermont	1		
Virginia		1	
Washington		1	
West Virginia		1	
Wisconsin		1	
Guam		1	
Virgin Islands			1
1=Yes			

APPENDIX TABLE B.20
 FREQUENCY OF REFERRAL OF NONEXEMPT RECIPIENTS FOR ASSESSMENT
 AND STATUS OF VOLUNTEERS IN ASSESSMENT COUNT (Q.3.02.03)

	How Often are Nonexempt Recipients Referred for Assessment		
	Only Once Each 12 Months	At Every Application or Break in Certification	At Every Eligibility Review/Recertification
Alabama	1	1	
Alaska		1	1
Arizona		1	1
Arkansas			
California	1	1	1
Colorado		1	
Delaware	1		
Florida		1	
Georgia	1		
Hawaii		1	
Idaho		1	
Illinois		1	
Iowa			
Kansas			
Kentucky			
Maine			
Minnesota			
Mississippi		1	
Missouri		1	
Montana	1		
Nebraska			
Nevada		1	
New Hampshire			
New Jersey			
New Mexico			

1=Yes

CONTINUED

APPENDIX TABLE B.20
 FREQUENCY OF REFERRAL OF NONEXEMPT RECIPIENTS FOR ASSESSMENT
 AND STATUS OF VOLUNTEERS IN ASSESSMENT COUNT (Q.3.02.03)--CONTINUED

	How Often are Nonexempt Recipients Referred for Assessment		
	Only Once Each 12 Months	At Every Application or Break in Certification	At Every Eligibility Review/Recertification
New York		1	
North Carolina	1		
Oklahoma			
Oregon			1
South Carolina			
South Dakota	1	1	
Tennessee	1	1	
Texas		1	
Vermont			1
Virginia			
Washington	1		
West Virginia	1		
Wisconsin		1	1
Guam		1	
Virgin Islands			1

1=Yes

CONTINUED

APPENDIX TABLE B.20
 FREQUENCY OF REFERRAL OF NONEXEMPT RECIPIENTS FOR ASSESSMENT
 AND STATUS OF VOLUNTEERS IN ASSESSMENT COUNT (Q.3.02.03)--CONTINUED

STATE	When are Registrants Counted	
	First Time	Every Time
Alabama		
Alaska		1
Arizona		1
Arkansas		1
California		1
Colorado		1
Delaware		1
Florida		1
Georgia	1	
Hawaii		1
Idaho		1
Illinois		1
Iowa		1
Kansas		1
Kentucky		1
Maine		1
Minnesota		1
Mississippi		1
Missouri		1
Montana		1
Nebraska		1
Nevada		1
New Hampshire		1
New Jersey	1	
New Mexico		1
1=Yes		

CONTINUED

APPENDIX TABLE B.20
 FREQUENCY OF REFERRAL OF NONEXEMPT RECIPIENTS FOR ASSESSMENT
 AND STATUS OF VOLUNTEERS IN ASSESSMENT COUNT (Q.3.02.03)--CONTINUED

STATE	When are Registrants Counted	
	First Time	Every Time
New York	1	
North Carolina		1
Oklahoma		1
Oregon		1
South Carolina		1
South Dakota	1	
Tennessee		1
Texas		1
Vermont		1
Virginia		1
Washington		1
West Virginia		1
Wisconsin		1
Guam		1
Virgin Islands		1

1=Yes

CONTINUED

APPENDIX TABLE B.20
 FREQUENCY OF REFERRAL OF NONEXEMPT RECIPIENTS FOR ASSESSMENT
 AND STATUS OF VOLUNTEERS IN ASSESSMENT COUNT (Q.3.02.03)--CONTINUED

STATE	When are Registrants Counted	Exempts Who Volunteer for Job Search are Counted as Assessed (Q.3.03.02)
	----- Other	
Alabama	1	1
Alaska		1
Arizona		1
Arkansas		.
California		1
Colorado		1
Delaware		.
Florida		.
Georgia		.
Hawaii		
Idaho		.
Illinois		1
Iowa		.
Kansas		1
Kentucky		
Maine		.
Minnesota		1
Mississippi		1
Missouri		.
Montana		1
Nebraska		1
Nevada		1
New Hampshire		1
New Jersey		1

*Denotes missing data

1=Yes

CONTINUED

APPENDIX TABLE B.20
 FREQUENCY OF REFERRAL OF NONEXEMPT RECIPIENTS FOR ASSESSMENT
 AND STATUS OF VOLUNTEERS IN ASSESSMENT COUNT (Q.3.02.03) --CONTINUED

STATE	When are Registrants Counted	Exempts Who Volunteer for Job Search are Counted as Assessed (Q.3.03.02)
	----- Other	
New York		1
North Carolina		1
Oklahoma		1
Oregon		1
South Carolina		
South Dakota		.
Tennessee		.
Texas		
Vermont		1
Virginia		1
Washington		.
West Virginia		
Wisconsin		1
Guam		.
Virgin Islands		1
*Denotes missing data		
1=Yes		

APPENDIX TABLE B.21
ASSESSMENT REPORTING (Q3.03.03)

STATE	Exempts Who Volunteer for Job Search are Counted as Assessed	First Time	Every Time
Alabama	1		1
Alaska	1		1
Arizona	1		1
Arkansas	.		
California	1		1
Colorado	1		1
Connecticut	.		
Delaware	.		
Dist. of Columbia	.		
Florida	.		
Georgia	.		
Hawaii	0		
Idaho	.		
Illinois	1	1	
Indiana	.		
Iowa	.		
Kansas	1		
Kentucky	0		
Louisiana	.		
Maine	.		
Maryland	.		
Massachusetts	.		
Michigan	.		
Minnesota	1		1
Mississippi	1	1	
Missouri	.		
Montana	1		1
Nebraska	1		1
Nevada	1		1
New Hampshire	1		1

*Denotes data missing

1=Yes

0=No

CONTINUED

APPENDIX TABLE B.21
ASSESSMENT REPORTING (Q3.03.03)--CONTINUED

STATE	Exempts Who Volunteer for Job Search are Counted as Assessed	First Time	Every Time
New Jersey	1	1	
New Mexico	0		
New York	1	1	
North Carolina	1		1
North Dakota	.		
Ohio	.		
Oklahoma	1		
Oregon	1		1
Pennsylvania	.		
Rhode Island	.		
South Carolina	0		
South Dakota	.		
Tennessee	.		
Texas	0		
Utah	.		
Vermont	1		1
Virginia	1		1
Washington	.		
West Virginia	0		
Wisconsin	1		1
Wyoming	.		
Guam	.		
Virgin Islands	1		1

*Denotes data missing

1=Yes

0=No

CONTINUED

APPENDIX TABLE B.21
ASSESSMENT REPORTING (Q3.03.03)--CONTINUED

STATE	Other
Alabama	
Alaska	
Arizona	
Arkansas	
California	
Colorado	
Connecticut	
Delaware	
Dist. of Columbia	
Florida	
Georgia	
Hawaii	
Idaho	
Illinois	
Indiana	
Iowa	
Kansas	1
Kentucky	
Louisiana	
Maine	
Maryland	
Massachusetts	
Michigan	
Minnesota	
Mississippi	
Missouri	
Montana	
Nebraska	
Nevada	
New Hampshire	

*Denotes data missing

1=Yes

0=No

CONTINUED

APPENDIX TABLE B.21
ASSESSMENT REPORTING (Q3,03,03)--CONTINUED

STATE	Other
New Jersey	
New Mexico	
New York	
North Carolina	
North Dakota	
Ohio	
Oklahoma	1
Oregon	
Pennsylvania	
Rhode Island	
South Carolina	
South Dakota	
Tennessee	
Texas	
Utah	
Vermont	
Virginia	
Washington	
West Virginia	
Wisconsin	
Wyoming	
Guam	
Virgin Islands	

APPENDIX TABLE B.22
 CONDITION FOR REGISTRANT ENTERED JOB SEARCH STATUS
 AND STATUS OF JOB-READY REGISTRANTS IN ENTERED JOB SEARCH COUNTS (Q3.04.02)

STATE	When are Registrants Counted as Entered Job Search				Job-Ready Registrants Counted
	When Assigned to Job Search Status	When Part of Job Search is Completed	When All of Job Search is Completed	Other	
Alabama	1				
Alaska	1				1
Arizona	1				1
Arkansas	1				
California	1				
Colorado	1				
Delaware	1				
Florida	1				
Georgia			1		
Hawaii	1				1
Idaho	1				
Illinois	1				1
Iowa				1	
Kansas	1				1
Kentucky	1				1
Maine	1				
Minnesota	1				
Mississippi	1				1
Missouri	1				1
Montana	1				

1=Yes

CONTINUED

APPENDIX TABLE B.22
 CONDITION FOR REGISTRANT ENTERED JOB SEARCH STATUS
 AND STATUS OF JOB-READY REGISTRANTS IN ENTERED JOB SEARCH COUNTS (Q3.04.02)--CONTINUED

STATE	When are Registrants Counted as Entered Job Search				Job-Ready Registrants Counted as Entered Job Search
	When Assigned to Job Search Status	When Part of Job Search is Completed	When All of Job Search is Completed	Other	
Nebraska	1				1
Nevada	1				
New Hampshire	1				
New Jersey	1				
New Mexico		1			1
New York			1		
North Carolina	1				
Oklahoma	1				
Oregon	1				1
South Carolina	1				1
South Dakota	1				
Tennessee	1				1
Texas	1				1
Vermont	1				1
Virginia	1				
Washington	1				1
West Virginia	1				
Wisconsin	1				1
Guam	1				1
Virgin Islands	1				

1=Yes

APPENDIX TABLE B.23
FREQUENT REASONS FOR JOB-READY REGISTRANTS NOT COUNTED AS ENTERED JOB SEARCH
AND STATUS OF JOB-READY REGISTRANTS IN ENTERED JOB SEARCH COUNTS

STATE	Employed Part-time	Enrolled JTP	JS Delayed	Failed to Comply	No Job Contacts
Alabama	0	0	0	0	0
Alaska
Arizona
Arkansas	0	0	1	1	0
California	1	0	0	1	0
Colorado	1	1	1	0	0
Delaware	1	0	1	0	0
Florida	0	0	0	1	0
Georgia	0	0	1	1	0
Hawaii
Idaho	0	0	1	0	0
Illinois
Iowa	0	0	1	0	0
Kansas
Kentucky
Maine	1	1	1	1	0
Minnesota	1	0	1	1	0
Mississippi
Missouri
Montana	0	0	1	0	0
Nebraska
Nevada	1	1	0	1	0
New Hampshire	0	1	1	1	0
New Jersey	0	0	0	0	0
New Mexico

*Denotes data missing

1 =Yes

0=No

CONTINUED

APPENDIX TABLE B.23
FREQUENT REASONS FOR JOB-READY REGISTRANTS NOT COUNTED AS ENTERED JOB SEARCH
AND STATUS OF JOB-READY REGISTRANTS IN ENTERED JOB SEARCH COUNTS--CONTINUED

STATE	Employed Part-time	Enrolled JTP	JS Delayed	Failed to Comply	No Job Contacts
New York	0	0	0	0	0
North Carolina	0	0	0	0	0
Oklahoma	0	0	1	0	0
Oregon
South Carolina
South Dakota	0	0	1	0	0
Tennessee
Texas
Vermont
Virginia	0	0	1	1	0
Washington
West Virginia	1	1	1	1	0
Wisconsin
Guam
Virgin Islands	0	0	0	0	0

*Denotes data missing

1=Yes

0=No

CONTINUED

APPENDIX TABLE B.23
FREQUENT REASONS FOR JOB-READY REGISTRANTS NOT COUNTED AS ENTERED JOB SEARCH
AND STATUS OF JOB-READY REGISTRANTS IN ENTERED JOB SEARCH COUNTS---CONTINUED

STATE	Contacts Not Verified	Left FS Program	Other
Alabama	0	0	1
Alaska	.	.	.
Arizona	.	.	.
Arkansas	0	1	0
California	0	0	1
Colorado	0	1	0
Delaware	0	0	0
Florida	0	0	1
Georgia	0	0	1
Hawaii	.	.	.
Idaho	0	0	0
Illinois	.	.	.
Iowa	0	0	0
Kansas	.	.	.
Kentucky	.	.	.
Maine	0	1	1
Minnesota	0	1	0
Mississippi	.	.	.
Missouri	.	.	.
Montana	0	1	0
Nebraska	.	.	.
Nevada	0	0	0
New Hampshire	0	1	0
New Jersey	0	0	1
New Mexico	.	.	.

*Denotes data missing

1=Yes

0=No

CONTINUED

APPENDIX TABLE B.23
 FREQUENT REASONS FOR JOB-READY REGISTRANTS NOT COUNTED AS ENTERED JOB SEARCH
 AND STATUS OF JOB-READY REGISTRANTS IN ENTERED JOB SEARCH COUNTS--CONTINUED

STATE	Contacts Not Verified	Left FS Program	Other
Alabama	0	0	1
Alaska	.	.	.
Arizona	.	.	.
Arkansas	0	1	0
California	0	0	1
Colorado	0	1	0
Delaware	0	0	0
Florida	0	0	1
Georgia	0	0	1
Hawaii	.	.	.
Idaho	0	0	0
Illinois	.	.	.
Iowa	0	0	0
Kansas	.	.	.
Kentucky	.	.	.
Maine	0	1	1
Minnesota	0	1	0
Mississippi	.	.	.
Missouri	.	.	.
Montana	0	1	0
Nebraska	.	.	.
Nevada	0	0	0
New Hampshire	0	1	0
New Jersey	0	0	1
New Mexico	.	.	.

*Denotes data missing

1=Yes

0=No

CONTINUED

APPENDIX TABLE B.23
 FREQUENT REASONS FOR JOB-READY REGISTRANTS NOT COUNTED AS ENTERED JOB SEARCH
 AND STATUS OF JOB-READY REGISTRANTS IN ENTERED JOB SEARCH COUNTS--CONTINUED

STATE	Contacts Not Verified	Left FS Program	Other
New York	0	0	1
North Carolina	0	0	1
Oklahoma	0	0	0
Oregon	.	.	.
South Carolina	.	.	.
South Dakota	0	1	1
Tennessee	.	.	.
Texas	.	.	.
Vermont	.	.	.
Virginia	0	1	0
Washington	.	.	.
West Virginia	0	1	1
Wisconsin	.	.	.
Guam	.	.	.
Virgin Islands	0	0	1

*Denotes data missing

1=Yes

0=No

APPENDIX TABLE B.24
 FREQUENCY OF RECEIVING REPORTS OF NONCOMPLIANCE BY THE
 INCOME MAINTENANCE UNIT (Q3.07.02)

STATE	Daily	Weekly	Monthly	No Specific Schedule	Other Schedule
Alabama	1				
Alaska	1				
Arizona	1				
Arkansas					1
California					1
Colorado	1				
Delaware	1				
Florida				1	
Georgia	1				
Hawaii				1	
Idaho				1	
Illinois	1				
Iowa	1				
Kansas				1	
Kentucky				1	
Maine	1				
Minnesota				1	
Mississippi		1			
Missouri	1				
Montana					1
Nebraska	1				
Nevada				1	
New Hampshire				1	
New Jersey		1			
New Mexico		1			

1=Yes

CONTINUED

APPENDIX TABLE B.24
FREQUENCY OF RECEIVING REPORTS OF NONCOMPLIANCE BY THE
INCOME MAINTENANCE UNIT (Q3,07,02)--CONTINUED

STATE	Daily	Weekly	Monthly	No Specific Schedule	Other Schedule
New York	1				
North Carolina	1				
Oklahoma	1				
Oregon			1		
South Carolina				1	
South Dakota				1	
Tennessee	1				
Texas	1				
Vermont		1			
Virginia					1
Washington	1				
West Virginia	1				
Wisconsin				1	
Guam					1
Virgin Islands					1
1-Yes					

APPENDIX TABLE B.25
FREQUENCY OF REVIEW OF NONCOMPLIANCE REPORTS BY THE INCOME MAINTENANCE UNIT

STATE	Daily	Weekly	Monthly	At Recertification	At Reapplication
Alabama					
Alaska	1				
Arizona	1				
Arkansas					
California					
Colorado					
Delaware	1				
Florida					
Georgia		1			
Hawaii					
Idaho					
Illinois	1				
Iowa					
Kansas					
Kentucky					
Maine					
Minnesota					
Mississippi					
Missouri	1				
Montana		1			
Nebraska	1				
Nevada					
New Hampshire					
New Jersey					
New Mexico	1				

1=Yes

CONTINUED

APPENDIX TABLE B.25
FREQUENCY OF REVIEW OF NONCOMPLIANCE REPORTS BY THE INCOME MAINTENANCE UNIT--CONTINUED

STATE	Daily	Weekly	Monthly	At Recertification	At Reapplication
New York	1				
North Carolina					
Oklahoma	1				
Oregon			1		
South Carolina	1				
South Dakota					
Tennessee	1				
Texas					
Vermont		1			
Virginia					
Washington	1				
West Virginia	1				
Wisconsin					
Guam					
Virgin Islands			1		

1=Yes

CONTINUED

APPENDIX TABLE B.25
FREQUENCY OF REVIEW OF NONCOMPLIANCE REPORTS BY
THE INCOME MAINTENANCE UNIT--CONTINUED

STATE	No Specific Schedule	Other Schedule
Alabama	1	
Alaska		
Arizona		
Arkansas		1
California		1
Colorado	1	
Delaware		
Florida	1	
Georgia		
Hawaii	1	
Idaho	1	
Illinois		
Iowa		1
Kansas	1	
Kentucky	1	
Maine	1	
Minnesota	1	
Mississippi		1
Missouri		
Montana		
Nebraska		
Nevada	1	
New Hampshire	1	
New Jersey		1
New Mexico		

1=Yes

CONTINUED

APPENDIX TABLE B.25
 FREQUENCY OF REVIEW OF NONCOMPLIANCE REPORTS BY
 THE INCOME MAINTENANCE UNIT--CONTINUED

STATE	No Specific Schedule	Other Schedule
New York		
North Carolina	1	
Oklahoma		
Oregon		
South Carolina		
South Dakota	1	
Tennessee		
Texas	1	
Vermont		
Virginia		1
Washington		
West Virginia		
Wisconsin		1
Guam		1
Virgin Islands		

1=Yes

APPENDIX TABLE B.26
EXPANSION OF WORK REGISTRATION/JOB SEARCH (Q4.01, Q4.02)

STATE	Expand	Large FS Caseload	Good Job Markets	High FS Allotments	Cert GT 2 Months	Concentration of Job-Ready Cases
Alabama	1	1	1	0	0	0
Alaska	1	1	1	0	0	0
Arizona	1	0	1	0	0	1
Arkansas	1	1	1	0	0	0
California	0	0	0	0	0	0
Colorado	1	1	0	1	0	0
Connecticut	1	0	0	0	0	1
Delaware	1
Dist. of Columbia	1	0	0	0	1	1
Florida	1	1	1	0	1	1
Georgia	1	0	1	0	0	0
Hawaii	1	1	1	1	1	1
Idaho	1	0	0	0	0	0
Illinois	1	1	1	0	0	0
Indiana	1	1	1	1	1	1
Iowa	1	0	1	0	0	0
Kansas	1	1	0	0	0	1
Kentucky
Louisiana	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maine	1	1	1	0	0	0
Maryland	1	1	1	0	1	0
Massachusetts	1	0	0	0	0	0
Michigan	0
Minnesota	1	1	1	0	0	0
Mississippi	1	0	1	0	0	0
Missouri	0	1	0	0	0	0
Montana	1	1	1	0	0	1
Nebraska	1	0	0	0	0	0
Nevada	1	1	1	1	1	1
New Hampshire	1	1	1	0	0	0
New Jersey	1	0	0	0	0	0

*Denotes data missing

1=Yes

0=No

CONTINUED

APPENDIX TABLE B.26

EXPANSION OF WORK REGISTRATION/JOB SEARCH (Q4.01, Q4.02)--CONTINUED

STATE	Expand	Large FS Caseload	Good Job Markets	High FS Allotments	Cert GT 2 Months	Concentration of Job-Ready Cases
New Mexico	1	0	0	0	0	0
New York	1	0	0	0	0	0
North Carolina	1	0	0	0	0	0
North Dakota	1
Ohio	0	0	0	0	0	0
Oklahoma	1	1	1	0	0	0
Oregon	1	0	0	0	0	0
Pennsylvania	1	0	0	0	0	0
Rhode Island	1	0	1	0	0	0
South Carolina	1	1	1	0	0	1
South Dakota	1	0	1	0	0	0
Tennessee	1	1	0	0	0	0
Texas	1	1	1	0	0	0
Utah	1	0	1	0	0	0
Vermont	1	1	1	0	0	1
Virginia	1	0	0	0	0	0
Washington	1	0	0	0	0	0
West Virginia	0	0	0	0	0	0
Wisconsin	1	1	1	1	0	0
Wyoming	1	0	1	0	0	0
Guam	1	0	0	0	0	0
Virgin Islands	0

*Denotes data missing

1=Yes

0=No

CONTINUED

APPENDIX TABLE B.26

EXPANSION OF WORK REGISTRATION/JOB SEARCH (Q4.01, Q4.02)--CONTINUED

STATE	Absence of Other	Coord with Other	Local Preference	Other
Alabama	0	0	0	0
Alaska	0	1	0	0
Arizona	0	0	0	0
Arkansas	0	1	0	0
California	0	0	0	1
Colorado	1	1	0	0
Connecticut	0	1	0	0
Delaware
Dist. of Columbia	0	1	0	0
Florida	0	0	0	0
Georgia	0	1	0	0
Hawaii	1	1	1	0
Idaho	0	1	0	0
Illinois	0	1	0	0
Indiana	1	1	1	1
Iowa	0	1	0	0
Kansas	1	1	1	0
Kentucky
Louisiana	1	1	0	1
Maine	0	0	0	0
Maryland	0	0	0	0
Massachusetts	0	1	0	0
Michigan
Minnesota	0	0	1	0
Mississippi	0	0	0	0
Missouri	0	1	1	0
Montana	0	1	1	0
Nebraska	0	1	0	0
Nevada	0	1	1	0
New Hampshire	1	0	0	0

*Denotes data missing

CONTINUED

1=Yes

0=No

APPENDIX TABLE B.26
EXPANSION OF WORK REGISTRATION/JOB SEARCH (Q4.01, Q4.02)--CONTINUED

STATE	Absence of Other	Coord with Other	Local Preference	Other
New Jersey	0	0	0	1
New Mexico	0	0	0	1
New York	0	0	1	0
North Carolina	1	1	0	0
North Dakota
Ohio	0	1	0	0
Oklahoma	0	0	0	1
Oregon	0	1	0	0
Pennsylvania	0	0	0	1
Rhode Island	1	0	0	0
South Carolina	0	0	0	0
South Dakota	0	0	0	0
Tennessee	0	0	0	1
Texas	0	0	0	1
Utah	0	0	0	0
Vermont	0	0	0	0
Virginia	0	0	1	0
Washington	0	0	0	1
West Virginia	0	0	0	1
Wisconsin	1	0	0	0
Wyoming	0	1	0	0
Guam	0	0	0	1
Virgin Islands

*Denotes data missing

1=Yes

0=No

APPENDIX TABLE B.27

CASES TARGETED FOR EXPANDED PROGRAM (Q4.03)

STATE	Targeted Cases					
	PA Cases	NPA Cases	PA and NPA	New Cases	Recert Cases	New and Recert
Alabama	0	1	0	0	0	1
Alaska	0	0	1	0	0	1
Arizona	0	0	1	0	0	1
Arkansas	0	0	1	0	0	1
California	0	1	0	0	0	1
Colorado	0	0	1	0	0	1
Connecticut	0	1	0	0	0	1
Delaware	0	0	1	0	0	1
Dist. of Columbia	0	0	1	0	0	1
Florida	0	1	0	0	0	1
Georgia	0	0	1	0	0	1
Hawaii	0	0	1	0	0	1
Idaho	0	0	1	0	0	1
Illinois	0	0	1	0	0	1
Indiana	0	0	1	0	0	1
Iowa
Kansas	0	0	1	0	0	1
Kentucky
Louisiana	0	1	0	0	0	1
Maine	0	0	1	0	0	1
Maryland	0	1	0	0	0	1
Massachusetts	0	0	1	0	0	1
Michigan	1	0	0	1	0	1
Minnesota	0	0	1	0	0	1
Mississippi	0	0	1	0	0	1

. Denotes missing data

1=YES

0=NO

CONTINUED

APPENDIX TABLE B.27
CASES TARGETED FOR EXPANDED PROGRAM (Q4.03)--CONTINUED

STATE	Targeted Cases					
	PA Cases	NPA Cases	PA and NPA	New Cases	Recent Cases	New and Recent
Missouri	0	0	1	0	0	1
Montana	0	0	1	0	0	1
Nebraska	0	0	1	0	0	1
Nevada	0	0	1	0	0	1
New Hampshire	0	0	1	0	0	1
New Jersey	0	1	0	0	0	1
New Mexico	0	0	1	0	1	0
New York	0	0	1	0	0	1
North Carolina	0	0	1	0	0	1
North Dakota
Ohio	0	0	1	0	0	1
Oklahoma	0	1	0	0	0	1
Oregon	0	0	1	0	0	1
Pennsylvania	0	1	0	0	0	1
Rhode Island	0	0	1	0	0	1
South Carolina	0	0	1	0	0	1
South Dakota	0	0	1	0	0	1
Tennessee	0	1	0	0	0	1
Texas	0	0	0	0	0	1
Utah	0	1	0	0	0	1
Vermont	0	1	0	0	0	1
Virginia	0	1	0	0	0	1
Washington	0	1	0	0	0	1
West Virginia
Wisconsin	0	1	0	0	0	1
Wyoming	0	0	1	0	0	1
Guam	0	1	0	0	0	1
Virgin Islands	0	0	0	0	0	1

. Denotes missing data

1=YES

0=NO

CONTINUED

APPENDIX TABLE B.27

CASES TARGETED FOR EXPANDED PROGRAM (Q4.03)--CONTINUED

STATE	Long Certification	Number of Months	Large Benefits	Benefit Size
Alabama	0	.	0	.
Alaska	0	.	0	.
Arizona	1	2	0	.
Arkansas	1	3	0	.
California	0	.	0	.
Colorado	1	3	0	.
Connecticut
Delaware	1	2	0	.
Dist. of Columbia	1	6	0	.
Florida	1	2	0	.
Georgia	1	3	1	150
Hawaii	0	.	0	.
Idaho	0	.	0	.
Illinois	0	.	0	.
Indiana	0	.	0	.
Iowa
Kansas	1	1	1	80
Kentucky
Louisiana	1	2	.	.
Maine
Maryland	1	1	1	.
Massachusetts	0	.	0	.
Michigan	0	.	0	.
Minnesota	.	.	0	.
Mississippi	0	.	0	.
Missouri	0	.	0	.
Montana	0	.	0	.
Nebraska	1	1	0	.

. Denotes missing data

1=YES

0=NO

CONTINUED

APPENDIX TABLE B.27

CASES TARGETED FOR EXPANDED PROGRAM (Q4.03)--CONTINUED

STATE	Long Certification	Number of Months	Large Benefits	Benefit Size
Nevada	1	1	0	.
New Hampshire	0	.	0	.
New Jersey	0	.	.	.
New Mexico	1	3	0	.
New York	1	3	0	.
North Carolina	0	.	0	.
North Dakota
Ohio	0	.	1	25
Oklahoma	0	.	0	.
Oregon	0	.	0	.
Pennsylvania	0	.	0	.
Rhode Island	1	3	0	.
South Carolina	0	.	0	.
South Dakota	0	.	0	.
Tennessee	1	3	1	141
Texas	0	.	0	.
Utah	1	3	1	150
Vermont	1	6	0	.
Virginia	1	1	0	.
Washington	1	3	0	.
West Virginia
Wisconsin	1	12	1	60
Wyoming	0	.	0	.
Guam	0	.	0	.
Virgin Islands	0	.	1	.

. Denotes missing data

1=YES

0=NO

APPENDIX TABLE B.28
NEW PROGRAM ELEMENTS THAT STATES WOULD ADD OR EXPAND

STATE	Applicant Job Search	Job Search Training	Work Experience and Training	Workfare	Coordination with Other Programs	Payment of Participant Expenses
Alabama
Alaska	1				1	1
Arizona	1	1				1
Arkansas		1			1	
California		.	.	.	1	
Colorado	1	1	1	1	1	1
Connecticut	
Delaware	.	1	1		1	1
Dist. of Columbia		1	1		1	1
Florida		1			1	1
Georgia	1	1	1		1	1
Hawaii		1			1	1
Idaho		1	1		1	1
Illinois	.	1	1	1	1	1
Indiana		1	1	1	1	1
Iowa
Kansas		1	1	1	1	1
Kentucky		1		.	1	1
Louisiana	1	1	1		1	
Maine		1	1		1	1
Maryland	1	1	1		1	
Massachusetts		1	1		1	1
Michigan		1	1	1	1	1
Minnesota		1	.		1	.
Mississippi	1	1	1			1
Missouri					1	
Montana		1	1	1	1	1
Nebraska	1	1			1	1
Nevada		1	1	1	1	1

*Denotes data missing

1=Yes

CONTINUED

APPENDIX TABLE B.28

NEW PROGRAM ELEMENTS THAT STATES WOULD ADD OR EXPAND

STATE	Applicant Job Search	Job Search Training	Work Experience and Training	Workfare	Coordination with Other Programs	Payment of Participant Expenses
New Hampshire	1	1	1		1	1
New Jersey		1			1	1
New Mexico	1	1	1	.	1	
New York	.	1	1		1	
North Carolina		1	1	1	1	1
North Dakota	1	1			1	1
Ohio	1	1	1	1	1	1
Oklahoma		1	1		1	1
Oregon	1	1	1	.	1	1
Pennsylvania		1	1	1	1	1
Rhode Island		1	1		.	1
South Carolina	1		1		1	1
South Dakota		1	.	.	1	1
Tennessee		1	1		.	1
Texas		1			1	1
Utah	1	1			1	1
Vermont	1	1	1		1	1
Virginia		1	1	1	1	1
Washington		1		1	1	1
West Virginia		1			1	
Wisconsin	1	1	1	1	1	1
Wyoming		1	1		1	1
Guam		1	1		1	1
Virgin Islands						

*Denotes data missing

1=Yes